



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>

Studies in church history

Bertrand Louis
Conway

LIBRARY
UNIVERSITY OF
CALIFORNIA
SANTA CRUZ

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

SANTA CRUZ

Gift of
EVERETT B. ANDERSON



.. THE UNIVERSITY LIBRARY ..



SANTA CRUZ



BX
890
C6
1916

STUDIES IN CHURCH HISTORY,

BY
BERTRAND L. ^{Louis} CONWAY
OF THE
PAULIST FATHERS

SECOND EDITION

ST. LOUIS, MO., 1916
PUBLISHED BY B. HERDER
17 SOUTH BROADWAY
68, GREAT RUSSELL STR.
LONDON, W. C.

NIHIL OBSTAT:

Remigius Lafort, S.T.D.,
Censor Deputatus.

IMPRIMATUR:

Joannes M. Farley,
Archiep. Neo Ebor.

Sept. 8, 1915

Copyright, 1915

by

Joseph Gummersbach

All rights reserved

Printed in U. S. A.

VAIL-BALLOU COMPANY
BINGHAMTON AND NEW YORK

PREFACE

THE present volume is made up of a number of essays and reviews which have already been published in the pages of *The Catholic World*. They are for the most part summaries of important volumes on Church History and synopses of important articles in some of the leading French encyclopedias. Many of the questions discussed in these pages are continually being asked, by earnest seekers after the truth, through the medium of the Question Box on the Paulist missions to non-Catholics.

Out of many volumes of typewritten questions actually submitted during the past seventeen years I find the following:

Is not asceticism opposed to the Gospel of Christ?

Did not monasticism arise from the cults of paganism?

Did Jesus really found a Church?

Was not the Episcopate a human institution?

Was not the early Church democratic?

Was not the Church Catholicized hundreds of years after Christ?

Did Christianity have any influence upon the legislation of the early Christian emperors?

Were not the early Christians communists?

PREFACE

What proof is there of the Assumption of the Virgin?

Did not the early Church refuse to pardon certain sins?

Was there ever a female Pope?

Were not the Catholics of Elizabeth's day traitors?

Are not Catholics afraid to publish all the documents relating to the Council of Trent?

Does not the condemnation of Galileo prove that your intolerant Church is hostile to science, and that your Popes are fallible?

All of these queries are answered in the following pages in a brief and popular manner, while ample references are given to works which discuss them in detail.

BERTRAND L. CONWAY, C. S. P.

CONTENTS

	PAGE
CHRISTIAN ASCETICISM IN THE FIRST THREE CENTURIES	3
THE GOVERNMENT OF THE CHURCH IN THE FIRST CENTURY	32
CHRISTIANITY AND THE ROMAN LAW	56
THE ASSUMPTION OF THE BLESSED VIRGIN	71
THE EDICT OF POPE CALLISTUS	89
THE LEGEND OF POPE JOAN	107
THE ORIGINAL DIARIES OF THE COUNCIL OF TRENT	119
CARDINAL ALLEN	138
THE CONDEMNATION OF GALILEO	155

STUDIES IN CHURCH HISTORY

STUDIES IN CHURCH HISTORY

CHRISTIAN ASCETICISM IN THE FIRST THREE CENTURIES¹

DURING the last fifty years rationalistic scholars have devised a number of arbitrary theories on the origin of monasticism. They have attempted to prove, by a vast array of pseudo-erudition, that the monastic life cannot be traced to Jesus Christ and the Twelve Apostles, but owes its origin to the Buddhistic monks of India,² the recluses of the temples of Serapis,³ the Jewish Essenians,⁴ the Therapeuta of Lake Mareotis,⁵ or the ascetics of Mithraism.⁶

The Abbé Martinez has recently published, under the auspices of the Catholic Institute of Paris, a schol-

¹ *L'Ascétisme Chrétien pendant les trois premiers siècles de l'Église.* By Abbé F. Martinez, S.M. Paris: Gabriel Beauchesne.

² Hilgenfeld, *Zeitschrift für wiss. Theol.*, 1867, p. 163.

³ Weingarten, *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte*, 1877, pp. 1-35, 545-547.

⁴ Staüdin, *Geschichte der Sittenlehre Jesu*; Gfrörer, *Philo und die Alex. Theosophie*.

⁵ Amenilaneau, cited in Ladeuze, *Étude sur le Cénobitisme Pakhōmien*, p. 169.

⁶ Reinach, *Orpheus*, p. 102; Cumont, *Textes et Monuments*, vol. i, p. 338 *et seq.*

arly treatise in refutation of these five *a priori* hypotheses. In a brief introduction⁷ he points out their inconsistency, while in the body of his work⁸ he gives us a most detailed account of the asceticism of the first three centuries, proving, beyond the shadow of a doubt, its Christian origin.

Chapter I treats of asceticism in the New Testament and in the Apostolic Age. Harnack⁹ and Dob-schütz¹⁰ both maintain that "Jesus Himself did not live the life of an ascetic." It is true indeed that He practiced celibacy and poverty but they were required by His special mission. There is nothing in His teaching, nor in that of the Apostles, to justify the extraordinary development of the ascetic life. In reality, it goes directly counter to the very principles of Christianity. This is clearly proved by the fact that the progress of asceticism and the development of Christianity did not go hand in hand. The primitive Christian communities were in no sense communities of ascetics; their success depended on their making Christianity a practical matter of every day life. The early apologists never appealed to the heroism of the Christian ascetics in their defense of Christianity, but commended the spirit of charity which filled every true Christian heart.

⁷ Pages 1-18.

⁸ Pages 19-204.

⁹ *Sitzungber. der Kön. preuss. Akad. der Wiss.*, 1891, vol. 1, p. 11.

¹⁰ *Die Urchristlichen Gemeinden*, p. 261.

This in brief is the rationalistic thesis, which the Abbé Martinez refutes by a thorough study of all the passages of the New Testament which refer to the place of asceticism in the teaching of our Saviour. The modern rationalist makes no distinction whatever between the orthodox asceticism of the Catholic Church and the Gnostic pseudo-asceticism, which was strongly denounced by the early Fathers on account of its false dogmatic basis and its pagan excesses. We will not be guilty of such a mistake.

Our Lord Jesus Christ, true God and true Man in one Divine personality, was not, we readily admit, a mere ascetic. His divine mission far surpassed the narrow outlook of the *continentes* of the primitive Christian communities. But it is evident from even a cursory study of the Gospels, that He both preached and practiced the principles of the ascetic life from the beginning to the end of His earthly ministry.

We know that our Saviour prepared for His public ministry by fasting forty days in the desert among wild beasts.¹¹ Not only was He the model of the virgin life, but He was most careful to guard against the slightest suspicion in the matter of purity. The disciples were astonished even to find Him talking with a woman.¹² He practiced poverty to such an extent that "He had not where to lay His head,"¹³ and He did not even have in his possession the stater for the tribute money.¹⁴ He often retired apart from the

¹¹ Matt. iv. 2; Mark i. 13.

¹³ Matt. viii. 20.

¹² John iv. 27.

¹⁴ Matt. xvii. 26.

multitude, and spent whole nights in prayer after days of most fatiguing preaching.¹⁶ Virginity, absolute poverty, and the love of solitude and prayer—these have ever been the characteristic virtues of the true ascetic. It is true that we find no mention of Our Lord's bodily mortifications, but we read continually of His laborious preaching from city to city,¹⁶ and His patient endurance of hunger, thirst, and bodily fatigue. We are not surprised, therefore, to find the early Fathers and ecclesiastical writers calling Jesus Christ "the Prince of Virgins,"¹⁷ alluding to His great poverty,¹⁸ and referring to the "His perfect asceticism."¹⁹

It is true that the ascetic teaching of Jesus does not hold the predominant place in the Gospels which our rationalistic critics think necessary for our defense of monasticism. But Our Lord did not come to establish a community of monks pledged to the highest degree of perfection, but to found a Church for all men. Our Lord's general moral teaching was undoubtedly most sublime. Christians are to be perfect as their Heavenly Father is perfect; they are all called upon to live a life of self-denial, sacrifice, renouncement, and suffering. His words are: "I came not to send peace but the sword. . . . He that taketh not up his cross is not worthy of Me." "He that shall lose his

¹⁶ Matt. xiv. 23; Mark vi. 31, 32; Luke v. 16; ix. 10, 18, 28; xi. 1; xxii. 39.

¹⁶ Luke viii. 1.

¹⁷ Methodius, Bishop of Olympia, *Convivium*, Orat X., iii.

¹⁸ Tertullian, *De Pænitentia*, viii.

¹⁹ Clement of Alexandria, *Strom*, iii, 6.

life for My sake shall find it." "If any man come to Me and hate not his father and mother, and wife, and children, and brethren, and sisters, yea, and his own life also, he cannot be My disciple."²⁰ Self-denial is an essential characteristic of the true follower of Jesus, and in times of persecution, such as He evidently had in mind in the above texts, this self-denial was to be heroic even unto death.

But there are other teachings of our Saviour intended only for an élite few. They are in no sense commandments for the multitude, but counsels left to the free choice of those who were to follow Him more intimately in the way of perfection. Protestantism, cursed with the worldly taint of a merely human gospel, has ever ignored Our Lord's teaching on the counsels. That is the chief reason of its bitter hatred of monasticism and the religious life. That is why the liberal Protestants of to-day do their utmost to trace the origin of asceticism to a pagan philosophy or a pagan religion.

Jesus mentioned the counsel of chastity in the nineteenth chapter of St. Matthew's Gospel. He was restoring marriage to its primitive purity, and prohibiting divorce even in the case of adultery. When, in view of this strict teaching, the disciples declared: "It is not expedient to marry," Jesus took occasion of their remonstrance to set forth clearly the practice of celibacy "for the kingdom of heaven." The prohibition of divorce is a commandment for all Christians;

²⁰ Matt. x. 34-38; Mark viii. 35; Luke ix. 24; xiv. 26.

the practice of celibacy is a counsel for the élite few. "He that can take, let him take it."²¹ Some non-Catholic scholars arbitrarily try to show that these last words of Our Lord refer to the indissolubility of marriage,²² while others think it strange that our Lord should recommend celibacy while extolling marriage.²³ The first theory does violence to the context, while the second sees opposition where in reality none exists. It is unquestionably true that Our Lord's counsel of celibacy marks the beginnings of asceticism, for virginity is its basic and essential element. Asceticism is possible even when the other practices that generally accompany virginity are absent; but without virginity it does not and cannot exist.

Jesus counseled poverty even more explicitly. He said: "Do not possess gold, nor silver, nor money in your purses." "Take nothing for your journey, neither staff, nor scrip, nor bread, nor money." "Sell what you possess and give alms." "Every one that doth not renounce all that he possesseth cannot be My disciple." "If thou wilt be perfect, go sell what thou hast, and give to the poor."²⁴ He did not give a command to the rich young man, but clearly made an appeal to his generosity: "If thou wilt be perfect" are His words.²⁵ Finally, Jesus asked His chosen ones to renounce their own wills, "to deny

²¹ Matt. xix. 12.

²² Zahn, *Komment. zum N. T.-Ev. Matt.*, p. 389 *et seq.*

²³ Allen, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary of St. Matthew*, p. 205.

²⁴ Matt. x. 9; Luke ix. 3; xii. 33; xiv. 33; Matt. xix. 21.

²⁵ Knabenbauer, *Comm. in Matt.*, p. 158.

themselves and to take up their cross.”²⁶ Harnack²⁷ is wrong in declaring that the Catholic Church teaches two different moral codes, one for the multitude, and another for the monk who stands for a higher type of perfection. The difference between them is merely a difference of degree, or rather of means. Both have the same end in view, viz., the love of God and the love of the neighbor for God’s sake.

St. John the Baptist, who stands midway between the Old Law and the New, is a character well worthy of study from the viewpoint of asceticism. He is at once a Jewish prophet and a Christian ascetic. He led a solitary life in the desert of Juda, practised the most rigorous penance, and insisted upon his disciples fasting.²⁸ His ascetic life explains the veneration and love the people had for him.²⁹

The example and teaching of Jesus were the inspiration of His Apostles. Were the Apostles married men or celibates? St. Peter tells us that the Apostles left all things to follow Jesus,³⁰ but we are hardly justified in deducing much from so indefinite a statement. We know that St. Peter was married,³¹ and that St. Paul was not.³² The witness of the early ecclesiastical writers does not help us much, for their testimony is

²⁶ Matt. xvi. 24.

²⁷ *Das Wesen des Christenthums*, p. 51.

²⁸ Matt. iii. 4; Mark i. 6; Lev. xi. 22; Matt. ix. 14.

²⁹ Matt. xi. 9; Luke vii. 26; John v. 35; Luke iii. 15.

³⁰ Mark x. 28.

³¹ Mark i. 30.

³² 1 Cor. vii. 7.

rather late, and St. Clement of Alexandria⁸³ contradicts Tertullian.⁸⁴

Eusebius in his *Ecclesiastical History*⁸⁵ describes the austere asceticism of St. James, the first Bishop of Jerusalem, and mentions the virgin daughters of the evangelist Philip, "who did prophesy."⁸⁶ St. Clement of Alexandria speaks of the deacon Nicholas, who lived apart from his wife, and whose daughters were virgins. Mayer⁸⁷ is right in recognizing the germ of asceticism in the primitive Christian community of Jerusalem.⁸⁸ The communism which they practised like the monks of the fourth century, was by no means obligatory, as we learn from St. Peter's words to Ananias,⁸⁹ but a matter of free choice. The Acts say nothing, however, of the practice of virginity, which later on was to become the very essence of the ascetical life.

St. Paul's teaching on celibacy is set forth in the seventh chapter of his first Epistle to the Corinthians. Virginity is, absolutely speaking, a good state in itself; it is indeed preferable to marriage, because it enables the Christian to serve God better, and "to be holy both in body and in spirit." It is not intended for all, for "every one has his proper gift from God, one after this manner and another after that."

⁸³ *Strom.*, iii, 6.

⁸⁴ *De Monog.*, viii, cf. Leclercq, *Dict. d'Archéologie, Célibat.*

⁸⁵ II, ch. xxiii, 3, 5, 10; III, ch. xxxix, 9.

⁸⁶ Acts xxi. 9. Duchesne, *Hist. Anc. de l'Église*, vol. i, p. 135.

⁸⁷ *Die Christliche Asceze*, p. 6.

⁸⁸ Acts ii. 44, 45; v. 4.

⁸⁹ Acts v. 4.

In his letter to the Colossians, the Apostle discusses the asceticism of certain communities of Asia Minor, which was inspired by either Jewish or Pagan influences.⁴⁰ He does not find fault with their abstaining from meat and drink, as some ignorant controversialists have maintained, but, on the contrary, recognizes in their practices "a show of wisdom in their not sparing the body."⁴¹ He does, however, absolutely condemn the human motives of their ascetic practices as conducing to pride.⁴² Some Catholic writers have tried to make St. Paul a witness for the vow of virginity, by a forced interpretation of 1 Tim. x. 12: "Having damnation, because they have made void their first faith."⁴³ But the Abbé Martinez rightly rejects this hypothesis, as well as the supposed mention of the *Subintroductæ*⁴⁴ in 1 Cor. vii. 36-38.

St. John in the Apocalypse speaks with the greatest enthusiasm of the state of virginity. "They sang as it were a new canticle. . . . These are they (144,000) who were not defiled with women: for they are virgins. These follow the Lamb whithersoever He goeth. These were purchased from among men, the first fruits

⁴⁰ Prat, *La Théologie de St. Paul*, p. 391.

⁴¹ Col. ii. 23.

⁴² Col. ii. 18.

⁴³ Bigelmair, *Archiv. für kath. Kirchenrecht*, 1896, p. 85.

⁴⁴ The *Subintroductæ* were those virgins who, while desirous of remaining true to their profession, lived with men who had also pledged themselves to the virgin life. They were united in a spiritual bond. With the one exception of the marital relation, they lived in the closest possible intimacy. There is very little agreement among scholars as to their first appearance in history, their aim, or their relations with the ecclesiastical authorities.

to God and to the Lamb: and in their mouth was found no lie: for they are without spot before the throne of God.’’⁴⁵ It is probable that he mentions Sardis as the home of some of these ascetics.⁴⁶

No Catholic, of course, would expect to find in the Sacred Scriptures a complete and detailed account of asceticism or of the religious life. But the few passages we have quoted prove clearly that the asceticism of the fourth century is based upon the teachings of Jesus and His Apostles.

We have next to consider the testimony of the ecclesiastical writers of the first three centuries, studying as we do so the pseudo-asceticism of Gnosticism, Encratism, and Montanism, and the influences of Neo-Platonism on the orthodox asceticism of Alexandria.

The Apostle St. John was still living when St. Clement of Rome addressed his words of counsel to the ascetics of the Church of Corinth. Are not the following words an echo of St. Paul’s *proprium donum*?⁴⁷ ‘‘Let him who is chaste in body not glory therein, for he knows that it is Another Who bestows upon him the gift of continence.’’⁴⁸

St. Ignatius, on his road to Rome to be martyred for the faith, sends greetings to the virgins of Smyrna.⁴⁹ Even at this early date, virginity was recognized as a permanent state, and was highly honored

⁴⁵ Apoc. xiv. 3-5.

⁴⁶ Apoc. iii. 4.

⁴⁷ Proper gift, 1 Cor. vii. 7.

⁴⁸ Epis. ad. Cor., xxxviii. 2.

⁴⁹ Ad Smyrn., xiii, 1.

by the faithful. So much so, indeed, that some of these ascetics considered themselves superior to the bishop. St. Ignatius warns them against this spirit of pride, saying: "Asceticism is good; it honors the flesh of the Saviour; but the ascetic is subject to the bishop, who is the head of the community."⁵⁰

The *Didache*⁵¹ speaks of a special type of ascetics, known as apostles or prophets. They traveled from city to city of Syria preaching the Gospel like modern Catholic missionaries, never staying long in any one place. They practised poverty, never accepting money for their labors. Indeed, those who did accept money were by the very fact excluded from the rank of prophets. Even though their celibacy is not expressly mentioned, it may reasonably be inferred from their mode of life. Harnack⁵² interprets a rather difficult passage of the *Didache*⁵³ to mean that they were models of virginity and continence. They were held in such honor by the people, that the author of the *Didache* feels called upon to remind them, as St. Ignatius had done, of the rightful authority of the bishops and deacons.⁵⁴ Some of the bishops of this period also lived the ascetical life. Polycrates of Ephesus says of Bishop Melito of Sardis that he was "a eunuch, who lived entirely in the Holy Spirit."⁵⁵

⁵⁰ *Ad Polyc.*, v, 2; Duchesne, *Hist. Anc. de l'Église*, vol. i, p. 531.

⁵¹ A. D. 50-160.

⁵² *Lehre der Zwölf Apostel.*, p. 44 *et seq.*

⁵³ XI, 11.

⁵⁴ XV, 2.

⁵⁵ Eusebius, *Hist. Eccles.*, V, xxvi, 5.

14 STUDIES IN CHURCH HISTORY

The aim of Hermas in his *Shepherd* is to preach penance, and to renew the fervor of those who had grown lax during the bitter trials of persecution. Although he does not address the ascetics directly, he cannot avoid alluding to them. He tells us that his wife was as a sister to him, and that his continence has gained for him the grace of God. He is totally opposed to all idea of encratism; he admits that a widow may marry again without sin, although he believes widowhood more honorable in the sight of God. He speaks of the ascetics of Rome as little children, who have not been stained by sin; they do not know what sin is, for they have always remained pure. He says that they are happy, inasmuch as their reward is great in the sight of God.⁵⁶

There has been a great deal of controversy about the meaning of a certain passage in the *Shepherd*, viz., Sim. ix, 10, 6. Funk and Achelis believe that it refers clearly to the *Subintroductæ*, while Zahn and Harnack think that they did not come into being until the third century. Most probably the disputed passage does not refer to any real occurrence at all.⁵⁷

About the middle of the second century the Apologists Justin, Tatian, Athenagoras, Minucius Felix, and others began to write to the pagan emperors their eloquent apologies of the Christian faith. One of their strongest arguments was to contrast the simple and pure lives of the Christians with the corruption of an

⁵⁶ Vis. i, 2-4; ii, 2, 3; Mand. iv, 4; Sim. ix, 29; xi, 29, 31.

⁵⁷ Page 41.

immoral and a debased paganism. If the ascetic life had attained a more perfect development, they might have insisted more on the heroism of these superior souls. But the ascetics still lived in the world, and were in no way distinguishable from the body of the faithful. However, they were far from neglecting so powerful an argument. They were proud of the number of those who had lived the virgin life, and they defied the pagans to produce men or women comparable to them in virtue.

St. Justin Martyr, after painting a vivid picture of pagan immorality, says: “When we marry, we marry to bring forth children; when we renounce marriage, we are perfectly continent.”⁵⁸ In two other passages he speaks of the great number of Christians who are practising celibacy and poverty.⁵⁹ Both Tatian and Athenagoras insist on the purity of the Christian women of their day, the latter saying that they were pure body and soul, shunning even evil thoughts and desires. He also declares with St. Paul, that many men and women who remain virgins to extreme old age, do so for the sole purpose of uniting themselves more intimately with God.⁶⁰ The Gospel origin of asceticism could not be more clearly put. Minucius Felix at the close of the second century writes: “Many are possessed of a body spotless by a perpetual virginity, although they do not boast of it. So far

⁵⁸ *I. Apol.*, xxix.

⁵⁹ *I. Apol.*, xiv, 2; xv, 6.

⁶⁰ Tatian, *Oratio*, 33; Athenagoras, *Legatio*, 33.

removed is incest from our hearts, that some regard even the marriage bond with a sense of shame.”⁶¹

It is clear from the few documents that remain to us of this second century, that asceticism was honored everywhere, both in the East and in the West; in Syria, in Asia Minor, in Greece, and in Rome. Wherever Christianity spread, generous souls by the thousands spontaneously followed, not merely the commands of the Lord, but also His free counsels of virginity and poverty.⁶²

These virgins did not live apart from their families. They were regarded as superior to the average Christian, though like them subject to their legitimate pastors. Their influence for good was felt not only by the faithful about them, but by the pagan world outside, which often bore tribute to “their purity, mastery of soul, and passionate love of virtue.”⁶³ Their asceticism was in no way dependent upon false dualistic theories of Gnosticism, but was prompted by the idea of following more closely in the footsteps of the Lord Jesus Christ. Among the causes that explain the maintenance and development of the ascetic life, the chief are: First, the expectation of the second coming of the Saviour;⁶⁴ second, the constant menace of persecution;⁶⁵ and third, the natural reaction that

⁶¹ Oct. xxxix.

⁶² Minucius Felix mentions poverty in Oct. xxxvi.

⁶³ Galien, quoted by Harnack, *Die Mission und Ausbreitung des Christenthums*, p. 157.

⁶⁴ 1 Cor. vii. 29-31; *Ep. Barn.*, iv, 3, 9; *Did.*, x, 5, 16; *Tert. Ad. Uxor.*, i, 3, 5; *De Jejunio*, xii; *De Fuga*, xii.

⁶⁵ Batifol, *l'Église naissante et le Cath.*, p. 22.

meets one extreme by another. The corrupt paganism of the day needed the corrective of purity, poverty, and self-denial. Every Christian by his very profession was in a certain sense an ascetic.

No greater mistake can be made by the student of early Church history than to confound the orthodox asceticism of the Christian Church with the exaggerated and erroneous asceticism of Gnosticism, Encratism, and Monatism. Gnosticism taught that matter was intrinsically evil. This theory logically produced a shameless licentiousness on the one hand, and a most rigorous asceticism on the other. The Nicolaites, Simon Magus and his followers, the Valentinians, the Basilidians, and the Carpocratians belonged to the first class, while Saturninus, Cerdon, and Marcion were the leaders of the second. Marcion, for example, forbade his followers to marry, and refused to baptize married men and women unless they lived apart. He also prohibited the use of meat and wine even for the Eucharist. His excessive austerity attracted thousands of adherents.⁶⁶ His practical mind discarded most of the metaphysical subtleties that appealed only to the élite in Gnosticism, and he modeled his sect upon the organization of the Christian Church.⁶⁷ Still, his influence on the development of orthodox asceticism was absolutely nil. The Fathers of the Church unanimously condemned the Gnostic teaching, that matter was eternal and essentially evil.

⁶⁶ St. Justin, *Apol.* i, 26, 58; Eusebius, *Hist. Eccles.* vi, 11; Clement of Alexandria, *Strom.*, iii, 4.

⁶⁷ Tertullian, *Adv. Marc.*, iv, 5.

All that God has created is good; there is nothing evil but sin.⁶⁸ Marriage and procreation, instead of being the work of the devil, were sacred.⁶⁹ Christians also abstain and fast, but their motive is the love and following of Jesus; meat and drink are not evil in themselves. It is false to hold that every Christian must be an ascetic. On the contrary, virginity is a matter of free choice, and not of universal obligation.⁷⁰

Encratism, which existed in the first days of Christianity,⁷¹ endeavored to impose asceticism upon every Christian. At the outset, the *encratitai*⁷² were not out-and-out heretics; they believed everything that the Church taught about God and about Jesus Christ. But they soon departed from the orthodox teaching by their obstinate adherence to an ultra rigorous asceticism. They condemned marriage, drank nothing but water, and would not eat anything possessed of life.⁷³ Later on they became identified with the Gnostics and the Montanists.⁷⁴ Encratism was especially powerful in the Eastern Church, where its teachings were spread by means of religious romances like the *Apocryphal Acts of the Apostles*, the *Gospel of the*

⁶⁸ Clement of Alexandria, *Strom.*, ii, 12.

⁶⁹ Tertullian, *De Anima*, xxvii. "Natura veneranda est, non erubescenda. Concubitum libido, non condicio foedavit. Excessus, non status, est impudicus, siquidem benedictus status apud Deum: Crescite et in multititudinem proficite."

⁷⁰ Duchesne, *Hist. Anc. de l'Église*, vol. i, p. 487.

⁷¹ 1 Tim. iv. 1-5.

⁷² Hippol. *Philos.*, viii.

⁷³ Batiffol, *Études d'Hist. et de Théol.*; Leclercq, *Dict. d'Arch.*, col. 2605.

⁷⁴ Harnack, *Dogmengeschichte*, p. 226.

*Heb*reus, the *Acts of Paul*, the *Acts of John*, and the *Martyrdom of Peter*. Now and again, Encratism gained some following among the simple faithful, but it never became the official teaching of the Church. The Fathers of the first three centuries were unanimous in asserting the absolute freedom of virginity, and the other practices of the ascetic life.⁷⁵

The rigorous asceticism of Montanism was energetically combated by the Church from the beginning. Apollinaris, Melito, Alcibiades, and others wrote special treatises against it, while synods were held all throughout Asia Minor to condemn it. Rome, which at first hesitated, finally banned it in the name of Popes Victor and Zephyrinus.⁷⁶

Tertullian tells us that ascetics were very numerous at Carthage.⁷⁷ Men and women vied with one another in the practice of the virgin life. Many kept their bodies spotless to extreme old age.⁷⁸ Even married folks often renounced their marital rights.⁷⁹ The people venerated the virgins, and the clergy reserved for them the first place in the church near the altar.⁸⁰ Tertullian praises virginity, but never to the detriment of marriage. He declares with St. Paul that marriage is good, but that virginity is better. The great merit of virginity lies in its being embraced

⁷⁵ Cf. Dionysius, Bishop of Corinth, in Eusebius, *Hist. Eccl.*, IV, xxiii, 7, and the martyrs of Lyons in *ibid.*, V, iii, 2.

⁷⁶ Funk, *Kirchenlexicon*, viii, col. 1831.

⁷⁷ *De Ress. Carnis.*, lxi.

⁷⁹ *Ad Uxorem*, vi.

⁷⁸ *De Vel. Virg.*, x; *Apol.*, ix.

⁸⁰ *De Vel. Virg.*, xi; xiv.

freely.⁸¹ It is the highest form of sanctity; a gift of God, to be guarded without boasting, and in all humility; ⁸² its reward is the kingdom of God.⁸³

The virgins of the third century continued to live in the midst of their families, a fact responsible for the abuses mentioned by Tertullian. Even though we make due allowance for his vehement invectives, we must admit that some of the virgins at Carthage were vain and immoral.⁸⁴ The scandals alluded to were rare indeed, but they prove the necessity of the safeguards afforded later on by the common life.

Some scholars declare that the fourteenth chapter of the *De Velandis Virginibus* refers to the *Subintroductæ*, but we do not think they prove their contention.

Tertullian says nothing about the practice of poverty. But his words on that subject may reasonably be applied to the ascetics of his time. He declares money "the cause of injustice, and the lord of the world."⁸⁵ He holds up the example of poverty given by the Saviour, and calls especial attention to the invitation of Jesus to the rich young man to sell all he possessed, if he would be perfect.⁸⁶

The ascetics of Carthage practised mortification, chiefly in the form of abstinence from meat and wine. Their only motive was to humble themselves in God's

⁸¹ *Adv. Marc.*, i, 29.

⁸² *De Ex. Cast.*, i; *De Vel. Virg.*, xiii.

⁸³ *Ad Uxorium*, vi.

⁸⁴ *De Vel. Virg.*, xiv.

⁸⁵ *Adv. Marc.*, IV, xxiii.

⁸⁶ *De Pœnitentia*, vii; *Adv. Marc.*, iv, 36.

sight, and to preserve their chastity by mortifying their love of eating and drinking.⁸⁷

Some Catholic writers, like Wilpert,⁸⁸ Schiwietz,⁸⁹ Dom Besse,⁹⁰ and Heimbucher⁹¹ maintain that Tertullian not only speaks of the vow of virginity in his *De Velandis Virginibus*,⁹² but that he distinguishes between private and public vows of virginity. But this is a most arbitrary reading of the text. There is no passage in Tertullian which mentions clearly the existence of a public vow; although there are some texts which probably may refer to a private vow. We call attention to the special terms which Tertullian uses when speaking of the virgin state.⁹³

With St. Cyprian the ascetic life takes on a new phase. We know from a letter that he wrote to Bishop Pomponius,⁹⁴ that the virgin of his time made a vow of virginity, which was not an ordinary promise, but a sacred vow that made her a spiritual bride of Christ. He regarded the violation of this vow as a serious crime involving excommunication, and exacted a rigorous penance before he admitted the guilty one to communion.

⁸⁷ *De Cult. Foem.*, ii, 9.

⁸⁸ *Die Gottgeweihten Jungfrauen*, p. 20.

⁸⁹ *Das Morgenl. Mönchtum*, p. 19.

⁹⁰ *Le Monachisme Africain*, p. 37.

⁹¹ *Die Orden und Congregationem der Kat. Kirche*, p. 157.

⁹² Chapters iii, xiv, xv.

⁹³ *De Oratione*, 22; *De Vel. Virg.*, iii, xi, xiii, xvi; *De Ress Carnis*, xli. *Nupesiisti Christo, illi carnem tuam tradidisti; age pro mariti tui disciplina. Si nuptas alienas velari jubet, suas utique multo magis.* He calls the virgins in other passages *virgines sacræ; virgines sanctæ; maritæ Christo*, etc.

⁹⁴ *Epis.* lxii.

Amidst the many cares of a most onerous episcopate, St. Cyprian always manifested a special affection for the virgins of Carthage.⁹⁵ He speaks of them continually in his works, and, in fact, wrote himself the first complete treatise we possess on the ascetic life. He tells us that the ascetics were very numerous, and that every class of society was represented in their ranks.⁹⁶ He styles them "the chosen portion of the flock of Christ," and ranks them immediately after the martyrs. We know that they were worthy of his praise by their love of martyrdom.⁹⁷ Virginity is a free state, embraced in order to attain perfection, and to acquire the virtues of justice, religion, faith, humility, patience, and mercy; its reward is the kingdom of heaven.⁹⁸

St. Cyprian makes no mention of the practice of poverty. The virgins always kept enough money to supply their wants, and those of noble birth lived according to their state of life. Although the bishop did not praise them for this,⁹⁹ he simply urged them to despise the world and its pleasures. Above all they are to avoid all luxurious dressing in silk and purple, the use of gold and precious stones, and any outward adornment calculated to attract the looks of lascivious young men.¹⁰⁰ He quotes, like his predecessors, the

⁹⁵ *De Habit. Virg.*, iii.

⁹⁶ *Epis. ad Antonianum, De Hab. Virg.*, vii.

⁹⁷ *Epis. lxxvii; De Lapsis*, ii.

⁹⁸ *De Hab. Virg.*, xxiii.

⁹⁹ *Ibid.*, vii.

¹⁰⁰ *Ibid.*, viii, ix, xiii, xvi, etc.

words of our Lord to the rich young man of the Gospel.¹⁰¹

He says little about mortification, save to cite the words of St. Paul,¹⁰² and to insist upon moderation in eating and drinking in order to obtain a better command over the passions, and to devote oneself more ardently to prayer.¹⁰³

Although there is still no evidence of the virgins living the common life, St. Cyprian's constant exhortations to lead a more recollected life, and to shun promiscuous gatherings at banquets and the public baths, prepared the way for the common life of a later period. The scandals of the *Subintroductæ* which are spoken of plainly in the sixty-second letter of St. Cyprian, also pointed in that direction.

Outside of the *Shepherd of Hermas* and the writings of Hippolytus, we know hardly anything of the ascetic life in Rome during the first three centuries. Hippolytus mentions ascetic practices and meditation, and condemns the marriage of clerics.¹⁰⁴ He speaks of the ascetics living a life apart from the world, and meditating upon the things of heaven.¹⁰⁵

The frescoes of the catacombs give us a good idea of the ceremonies of a religious profession in the fourth, or perhaps at the close of the third, century.

¹⁰¹ Matt. xix. 21.

¹⁰² Gal. v. 24; vi. 14.

¹⁰³ *Epis.* vii.

¹⁰⁴ *In Proverbia*, P. G. x, col. 617; *La Théologie de St. Hipp.*, p. 53.

¹⁰⁵ *In Gen.*, P. G. x, col. 601.

The bishop presided, while the virgin pronounced before him the formula of consecration. He then laid hands upon her, and preached a sermon on the excellence and dignity of the virgin state. The faithful came in great numbers to witness what the Fathers called "a spiritual marriage." The virgin was then clothed with a special tunic or habit, as in the profession of a nun in a convent to-day.¹⁰⁶

These consecrated virgins spent a great part of the day in prayer; practised mortification under the form of fasting; studied the Sacred Scriptures; engaged in manual labor; observed a rule of silence, and lived apart from the world. All these practices prove the identity of the asceticism of Rome in the fourth century with the asceticism of other parts of the Christian world. As early as A. D. 350 the cloister was in existence, for at that date St. Marcella founded the first monastery in Rome.

We know scarcely anything of the progress of Christianity in Spain during the first three centuries. A couple of letters of St. Cyprian, and a chance allusion in St. Irenæus and Tertullian, are all that we possess.¹⁰⁷ There is one clear reference, however, to the virgins of Spain in the thirteenth canon of the Council of Elvira.¹⁰⁸ The Council was legislating in regard to those virgins who had broken their vows, either by marrying, or by falling into sins of impurity. If

¹⁰⁶ Cf. Fresco of the Catacomb of St. Priscilla, Wilpert, *Die Gottgeweihten Jungfrauen*, p. 52 *et seq.*

¹⁰⁷ *Adv. Haer.*, i, 10; *Adv. Jud.*, vii.

¹⁰⁸ Leclercq, *L'Espagne Chrétienne*, i, pp. 2, 5.

they continue in their sins, they are never to be admitted to communion, even at the hour of death; if they do penance, and do not relapse, they are to be reconciled on their deathbed.

Such legislation proves conclusively that asceticism had reached the same development in Spain as in North Africa. This is not at all surprising, when we remember the close communion between the Church in Spain and the Church in Carthage.

Many non-Catholic scholars like Keim,¹⁰⁹ Zöckler,¹¹⁰ and Harnack¹¹¹ assert that Neo-Platonism played a considerable part in the origin of monasticism. This theory, of course, is merely a part of their general thesis concerning the "Catholicizing," *i. e.*, the Hellenization or paganizing of Christianity. They hold, with many rationalistic thinkers, that under the influence of Greek philosophy, the spiritual liberty of the first two centuries gave way to the authoritative and bureaucratic spirit of Catholicism. Monsignor Batiffol has refuted this theory at length in his work on *Primitive Catholicism*. We are concerned with this theory only in so far as it affects asceticism.

It is true that great teachers like Clement of Alexandria and Origen made use of the Greek philosophy of their day the better to reach their age, but it by no means affected their ascetic teaching.

Clement of Alexandria declares, with St. Paul, that virginity is superior to marriage; that it is a grace of

¹⁰⁹ *Aus der Urchristentum*, p. 215.

¹¹⁰ *Ascese und Mönchtum*, p. 144.

¹¹¹ *Dogmengeschichte*, p. 252.

God to be gratefully received ; that it should be practised especially by those who wish to work efficaciously for their brethren.¹¹² He lays more stress, though, upon the dignity and sanctity of the married state, because the great evil of his time was the low birth rate due to the current pagan immorality. He seems, indeed, to prefer the Christian who marries, has children, and then lives the virgin life with his wife.¹¹³

He declares that riches are in themselves neither good nor evil ; they are merely an instrument ; all depends on how they are used.¹¹⁴ Extreme poverty is not a good thing, for it often prevents a man from considering the higher things of the spirit, in his constant struggle to make a living. One may be without riches, and yet be guilty of sin, because he is most desirous of them in his heart. True poverty, therefore, is poverty of spirit ; this alone frees a man from all affection for the things of this world.¹¹⁵ The truly great soul always despises riches.¹¹⁶

He recommends mortification as a means of strengthening the soul patiently to endure suffering, and to keep the Christian ever in the path of righteousness. An austere life will safeguard one from temptation, and prevent grievous falls.¹¹⁷ He also insists upon the mortification of the senses and abstinence from meat and wine, that the body might be kept pure from every stain. He urges the ascetic to pray continually, both in Church, at the canonical

¹¹² *Strom.*, iii, iv, xii.

¹¹⁵ *Ibid.*, xiii.

¹¹³ *Ibid.*, iii, 1, 16; vii, 12.

¹¹⁶ *Paed.*, ii, 3.

¹¹⁴ *Quis Dives Salvetur*, xiv.

¹¹⁷ *Ibid.*, ii, 1; *Strom.*, vii, 7.

hours, and alone in his room, meditating upon the eternal truths. The true Gnostic is rarely to ask God for temporal favors; his heart must be bent entirely on celestial things. There is no mention in Clement's writings of any public vow of virginity, and probably no reference even to private vows.

Origen continued and perfected the teaching of Clement of Alexandria on asceticism. History tells us very little of the life of Clement, but a great deal about his disciple. Origen was, indeed, a perfect type of the Christian ascetic. At eighteen years of age he was already the head of the great Christian school of Alexandria. Realizing the danger of falling away from true fervor because of the motley body of men and women who crowded to his lectures, he determined to lead a most austere life. He went to the extreme of making himself a eunuch for the kingdom of heaven.¹¹⁸ He also lived in the most absolute poverty. He sold his valuable library in exchange for four obols a day, which he considered enough for his immediate wants. He always walked barefooted, and wore but one garment. He abstained from wine, fasted frequently, slept but little, and on the bare ground, and exposed his body relentlessly to cold. In fact, every moment which he did not spend in study, or teaching, he devoted to the practices of austerity. Sickness at last forced him to discontinue these ascetic practices.

His teaching, therefore, is simply a commentary

¹¹⁸ Eusebius, *Hist. Eccles.* vi, 3.

upon his own manner of life. He recognized the lawfulness of marriage, and insisted on the freedom of virginity. He was rather rigoristic in his views on these matters, for we find him comparing the *slavery* of the marriage bond with the *liberty* of the virgin life. He was even ready to pardon the error of those widows who did not marry the second time for fear of hell. Those who married a second time might be saved, but they would not be crowned by Christ.¹¹⁹ He speaks of virgins as "flowers that ornament the Church of Christ," and ranks them immediately after the martyrs. Virginity is superior to marriage, because it allows one to worship God without ceasing.¹²⁰ He warns the ascetics against vanity, telling them that chastity is valueless unless accompanied by the other virtues. In a word, purity of body is of no avail without purity of soul.¹²¹ Jesus Christ is the model of every ascetic, who must live not for himself, but for Christ, Whose footsteps he must follow, and Whose cross he must bear. This distinguishes him at once from the philosophers of paganism. By their chastity the ascetics become like little children, and merit the kingdom of God. Origen, therefore, preaches asceticism, not in the name of his philosophical principles, but in the name of the Gospel, which is for him, as

¹¹⁹ *Cont. Cels.*, xx, 192; in *Epis. ad Rom.* vi, 12; vii, 295, 395; *Hom. xix in Jer.* xv, 366.

¹²⁰ *Hom. iii in Gen.*; *Hom. ii in Numb.*; *Hom. xxiii in Numb.*

¹²¹ In *Epis. ad Rom.*; Bornemann, in *Invest. mon. Origine*, p. 28.

for all the early Church writers, the unique source of the perfect life.¹²²

It is pretty certain that Origen speaks of the vow of virginity more than once in his writings. The clearest text of all is the following, quoted by Schi-wietz in his *Asceticism in the First Three Centuries*, p. 17: “*Et nos ergo, cum venimus ad Deum et vovemus ei nos in castitate servire, pronuntiamus labiis nostris et juramus nos castigare carnem nostram vel male ei facere atque in servitutem eam redigere, ut spiritum salvum facere possimus.*”

The ascetics of his time did not practice poverty. Monasteries were not yet in existence, so that every Christian had to provide for his own necessities. Origen insists on the true ascetic renouncing all superfluities, quoting the words of Christ.¹²³ He extols on page after page the virtue of poverty, calling it “a true holocaust upon the altar of the Lord.” The good of eternal life will compensate for the loss of present possessions.¹²⁴

Origen’s whole life proves the important place of mortification in asceticism, although he alludes to it directly in very few passages. Mortification is really an imitation of the Passion of Christ, and a means of purification for the soul consecrating itself entirely to God. It is a preservative of chastity, and helps the

¹²² *In Epis. ad Rom.*; *Hom. xxiv in Numb.*; *Hom. vi in Ezech.*; *Cont. Cels. xx*, 77; in *Matt. iii*, 238.

¹²³ *Luke xiv. 33.*

¹²⁴ *Hom. ix in Lev.*; in *Psal. xii*, 171.

Christian especially in the study of the Holy Scriptures. He recommends abstinence, meditation, prayer, vigils, and fasting as various means of mastering the lower nature.¹²⁵

Contemplation in his eyes is the height of perfection. It separates the ascetic from everything earthly and material, and makes him think only of God. The true ascetic must live in the world, but just as much apart from it as if he were living in the desert. Outside of the requirements of apostolic zeal, he should not engage in worldly affairs. He should imitate the Saviour, Who loved to retire frequently apart from His disciples.

In his commentary on St. Matthew,¹²⁶ Origen expresses his desire that the ascetics live the common life, but there is no proof that this wish of his was realized in his lifetime. We know from Eusebius that soon after the persecution of Diocletian, Peter, Bishop of Alexandria, passed his last days in ascetic practices in common with others.¹²⁷ Paul of Thebes, Anthony, and Hilarion were contemporaries or even predecessors of Bishop Peter of Alexandria.

The *Epistolæ ad Virgines* is the first document in ecclesiastical literature that treats *ex professo* of the ascetic life. It was written originally in Greek in the

¹²⁵ In Matt. iii, 171; *De Prin.*, xxi, 327; in Matt. iii, 238; Hom. xiii in *Ex.*

¹²⁶ III, 361.

¹²⁷ *Hist. Eccles.*, VII, xxxii, 31.

first decade of the third century.¹²⁸ The critics assign it to a Christian of Egypt, and say that it was addressed to the ascetics of Syria or Palestine. The writer praises virginity as "the blessed seed of God, the royal priesthood, the holy nation, and the people of God." The ascetic must have in view his own sanctification, and follow Jesus Christ as his model. He must practice an apostolate both of prayer and of action. He must not only preach the Gospel from city to city, but visit the orphans and widows, exorcize the possessed, and care for the sick. He still lives like other Christians in the cities and villages, but he is always known as an ascetic; in his journeyings he must stay with the ascetics of the town. The *Subintroductæ* are mentioned more than once, and clearly mark the tendency towards community life. Poverty and mortifications of various sorts are strongly recommended. Certain abuses are mentioned, such as the sins of vanity, idleness, avarice, and immorality.

Our last witness is Bishop Methodius of Olympia in Lycia. His *Convivium* gives us a picture of asceticism in Asia Minor, which is strikingly like conditions in Carthage a few years before. The development of asceticism in Asia Minor and Africa was not quite so advanced as in Egypt and the Orient.

¹²⁸ Harnack, *Sitzungsberichte*, vol. i.

THE GOVERNMENT OF THE CHURCH IN THE FIRST CENTURY¹

“THE Catholic Church,” writes Father Moran in the Preface of his scholarly essay on the beginnings of the Christian ministry, “bases her authority to teach and govern on the apostolic succession of her hierarchy. Christ founded a Church, and gave the Apostles whom He placed over it certain ecclesiastical powers to be transmitted by them to their successors to the end of time. The ecclesiastical superiors of to-day claim to teach and rule, not by election or delegation of the faithful, but by a kind of spiritual descent instituted by Christ. In this age of political liberalism and popular sovereignty, it is not surprising to find the Church assailed for her oligarchical constitution. Advanced Protestants would have the people supreme in the Church as in the State; while modern rationalists would have us believe that our hierarchical jurisdiction is the effect of evolution and the growth of centuries, and that it was unknown and unheard of in the early Church. It is with a view of answering these difficulties that I propose to inquire into the government of the primitive Church, and to

¹ *The Government of the Church in the First Century.* By Rev. William Moran. New York: Benziger Bros.

show that its constitution was in principle the same in the first century as it is in the twentieth."

What did Jesus Christ mean by "the Kingdom of God?" When Our Lord speaks of "the kingdom," He at once arouses the enthusiasm of the Jews, for the term stirs up in the national mind a world of hopes and expectations. The Jews in the captivity and in the dispersion had ever been sustained and encouraged by the prospect of the future glory and prosperity of the everlasting kingdom foretold by Daniel.² They did not realize the spiritual nature of the promises of the prophets, but looked forward to a great political empire, in which Israel would dominate the whole world. Jesus could not correct this false notion all at once, for the people would not have understood Him; the shock to their prejudices would have been too violent. His first care was, therefore, not to explain the nature of His kingdom, but rather to lead men quietly toward it; to establish the authority of His mission, and thus place Himself in a position to transform the popular idea.

Our Lord first tells the Jews that all human hopes and works must be made subservient to our last end: "What doth it profit a man, if he gain the whole world, and suffer the loss of his own soul?" "Blessed are they that suffer persecution for justice' sake, for theirs is the kingdom of heaven." In this world man's religious life is never free from persecution, risks, and temptations, but there is a life to

² Daniel vii. 26, 27.

come in which the blessed will enjoy all good things in peace. The words "Thy kingdom come" in the Lord's Prayer are a prayer for a kingdom on earth; but that kingdom consists in hallowing the name of the Father, and doing His will on earth, as it is done in heaven. This phase of the kingdom is opposed to the reign of sin and the devil: "What have we to do with Thee, Jesus of Nazareth; art Thou come to destroy us?" It is not so much a kingdom as a sovereignty, a reign of God in men's hearts. A spiritual entity, it is contrasted with the goods of this world. "Be not solicitous, therefore, saying what shall we eat, or what shall we drink, or wherewith shall we be clothed? . . . Seek ye first the kingdom of God."

This sovereignty is but the soul of an earthly phase of the kingdom, in the proper sense of the word. This kingdom is the collectivity of all those who believe in Christ and His teaching. "For this was I born," said Jesus to Pilate, "and for this came I into the world, that I should give testimony to the truth." His kingdom is primarily a kingdom of truth. It is not a puritanical reformation of Judaism, nor a prophetic school returning to a forgotten justice, but a new entity, based on a new revelation, which came, after John the Baptist, to complete the law and the prophets. It is a new glad tiding; a mysterious message; a hidden treasure; a pearl of great price. It is a message which the prophets longed to receive, and which the disciples are ac-

counted blessed to hear. This revelation Jesus calls the word of the kingdom.³

“The law and the prophets were until John; from that time the kingdom of God is preached, and every one useth violence towards it.”⁴ Here Jesus is not speaking of the final kingdom in heaven, nor of the sovereignty of God in men’s hearts, but of an external institution of some kind. “The time is accomplished, and the kingdom of God is at hand; repent and believe the Gospel,” says Jesus. The accomplished time is that spoken of by the prophets, after which “the Lord shall give Him the throne of David His father.” The kingdom is that of the Son of David, a true kingdom on earth, composed of all those who “repent and believe the Gospel.” This collectivity is represented as a seed-plot, where the good seed is sown, and where it germinates, and grows to a full harvest, to be at last gathered into the kingdom of the Father in heaven.⁵

The kingdom of God embraces in this life worthy and unworthy members, children of Christ and children of the devil. This is clear from the two parables of Jesus in Matt. xiii, which tell of the enemy sowing cockle among the wheat, and of the net containing good fish and bad. The citizens of the kingdom are those who understand the teaching of Christ, and have responded to the call of faith. Some guests

³ Matt. vi. 31; Luke xvi. 16; Mark i. 15; Matt. xiii. 11, 16, 17, 19, 44, 45.

⁴ Luke xvi. 16.

⁵ Matt. xii. 3, 18-23; Mark i. 15.

are invited to the marriage feast, but they refuse to attend. The call to the kingdom is a great free gift of God. The great sin of the Jews consisted in their refusal to accept the word of the kingdom. "The publicans and harlots," said Jesus, "shall go into the kingdom of God before you." "The kingdom of God shall be taken from you, and shall be given to a nation yielding the fruits thereof."⁶ Penance or conversion is the first condition for entrance into the kingdom. "Do penance, for the kingdom of God is at hand." The disciple of the kingdom must receive the word of God with the simple faith and trust of a little child. "Whosoever does not receive the kingdom of God as a little child, shall not enter it."⁷

On the road to Cæsarea Philippi, Jesus promises to make St. Peter the ruler of the kingdom of God after His death. "I will give to thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven. . . . Thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build My Church." Peter is to be the rock foundation; the Church built upon him will be indefectible; he will be the chief steward; his binding and loosing will be ratified in heaven; he will be the primate in the new kingdom. Later on, all the Apostles will receive together a promise to bind and loose with divine authority, becoming thereby partakers in one of the promises made to Peter. They will not, however, become the foundation; they will not receive the keys of the kingdom.

⁶ Matt. xxi. 43.

⁷ Mark x. 15.

Harnack fails to see in the teaching of Jesus the foundation of a Church, least of all a Universal Church. According to him Jesus was sent only to the lost sheep of the house of Israel, and in sending forth His disciples, He placed the same limits on their mission. Harnack maintains that the passages recording a universal mission, given by our Lord during the forty days, are but the expression of the Christian mind after it had seen the development of the Gospel for fifty years. The Apostles, no doubt, established a Universal Church before their death, but then "the chasm which separates Jesus from the Apostles has never been bridged over, nor can it be."

An unbiased examination of the four Gospels reveals naught of the narrow-minded nationalism suggested by Harnack. So little does Jesus think of an exclusively Jewish kingdom that, as a matter of fact, He tells us that the Jews will scarcely find a place in it at all. In the parable of the vineyard, Jesus tells the Jews that the kingdom will be taken from them and given to another nation. In the parable of the marriage feast, He develops the same idea. The prophet Isaias and John the Baptist both taught plainly that only a remnant of the Jews would inherit the promises, and Jesus frequently spoke of the exclusion of the Jews from the kingdom.⁸

In the tenth chapter of Matthew, we see that the Apostles received two distinct missions. The first, confined to the Jews, was only a temporary mission

⁸ Cf. Matt. viii. 11; Luke xiii.

which they shared in common with the seventy-two disciples. In this mission they organized no society, and enjoyed no special jurisdiction. A second and a greater mission is foreshadowed in Matt. x. 17, 18. The Apostles are to go forth on an unlimited mission; their testimony is to be given before Gentiles as well as Jews; they are to be brought before governors and kings as well as councils; they will, in short, be hated by all men, because they come in the name of Christ. Their great commission—"Going, therefore, teach all nations"—is not the invention of a pious Christian, as Harnack would have us believe; it is the fulfillment of promises made frequently by Christ during His public ministry.

Early in His ministry, Jesus selected twelve of His disciples, and gave them a special mission, and a special name, *Apostles*, literally *those sent, messengers*. The word was not borrowed from the Jews, nor was it of Scriptural origin. The apostolic office, in the discourses of Jesus, "seems to be chiefly a mission, a work of testimony."⁹

St. Paul brings out clearly the nature of the apostolic office, because his own claims to apostleship were frequently called in question. He defends eloquently the authenticity of his Gospel, the fruitfulness of his mission, and the hardships he endured, but above all he insists on the fact that he has been especially called and sent by Jesus Christ in person.¹⁰

⁹ Acts i. 8; Matt. x. 27; Matt. xxviii. 20.

¹⁰ Gal. i. 1, 11, 12, 15-17; 1 Cor. xi; xv; 2 Cor. v. 20; Rom. x. 14; 1 Cor. ii. 1.

From the very beginning, the Apostles were a center of authority for the Church. In the mother Church of Jerusalem, the supreme ecclesiastical authority was in their hands.¹¹ The Epistles of St. Paul represent them as the supreme teachers, the ambassadors of God, the dispensers of the mysteries of Christian knowledge, and the guarantee of the purity of Christian doctrine.¹² St. Paul also speaks of their power of jurisdiction, which has both a judicial¹³ and a legislative phase.¹⁴ The apostolate is not merely a magisterial *charisma*. St. Paul is equally a teacher and a ruler; he requires faith in his doctrine, and obedience to his ordinances. The preaching of the Gospel is not the free working of the Spirit. St. Paul preaches what he himself has received,¹⁵ the testimony of Christ. He governs, likewise, in virtue of the power he has received from Christ.¹⁶

While the first Christians in Palestine had many points in common with the Jews, they clearly formed a distinct society or Church. Men were initiated into this society by baptism; they had their specifically Christian meetings, with a symbol of brotherhood, the Eucharist; they were united by the same doctrine,

¹¹ Acts ii. 42; iv. 34.

¹² 1 Thess. ii. 13; 2 Thess. ii. 15; Gal. i. 7; 1 Cor. xiv. 37;

² Cor. xi. 28.

¹³ 1 Cor. v. 2; 2 Thess. iii. 16; 1 Tim. i. 20; 2 Cor. ii. 10;

² Cor. xiii. 2.

¹⁴ 1 Cor. vii; xi. 2; xiv. 26-34; 2 Cor. ii. 9; vii. 15.

¹⁵ 1 Cor. xv. 3.

¹⁶ 2 Cor. xiii. 10.

and the "same fellowship of the Apostles;" and they worked for the same spiritual end.¹⁷

Dr. Hatch¹⁸ sees in the early Christian communities merely an imitation of the pagan *collegia* from which they differed merely in one thing, their philanthropy. But he brings forward no convincing proof of this arbitrary statement. We are fully aware of the great charity of the early Church, which frequently found expression in hospitality and almsgiving. But this was nothing new; it was merely a continuation of the Jewish tradition. The Christians did not become brethren by loving and helping one another, as Hatch seems to think; they loved and helped one another because they were brethren. In a word, their common faith was the basis of their association. The local communities were religious societies, founded on a common faith, a common hope, and a common calling; they had a social life peculiar to themselves. They came together for the Eucharist, instruction, prayer, the reading of Scripture, and the exercise of spiritual gifts. This social life, and not the philanthropic idea, differentiated the Christian societies from the pagan associations.

Again the *collegium* was an autonomous, isolated association, usually formed under the protection of a tutelary deity. Its officers were elected annually, and derived their authority from the body which elected them. It was altogether different in the

¹⁷ *Acts* iv. 32.

¹⁸ *The Organization of the Early Christian Churches*, p. 12.

Christian community. The local Church embraced all the faithful of a city, however numerous they might be. Unlike the pagan funeral clubs, the Christians formed together one organized body; their officers were ordained by the Apostles, derived their powers from Christ through the Apostles, and held office for life. Their faith, morals, worship, and purpose were so utterly different from the pagans around them, that they would never have dreamed of turning to paganism for a type of their organization. As most of them in the beginning were converts from Judaism, they would naturally turn to the synagogue if on the lookout for a model.

From the very beginning the Christians had a special name for their community. They called it a church, *ekklesia*. This term was well known in all the Greek cities, where it meant the assembly of the citizens. It is used in a similar sense in the Old Testament.¹⁹ St. Paul sometimes uses the word in this sense,²⁰ but more commonly in a derivative sense, meaning all the Christians of a local community. Sometimes he applies the word to all the Christians of a particular household.²¹ He never speaks of the churches of a city, even though it contain many Christian households, but he often speaks of the churches of a province, because each town in the province has its own church.²² The local church is a "Church of

¹⁹ Judges xxii. Cf. Acts viii. 1.

²⁰ 1 Cor. xiv. 23, 24.

²¹ Rom. xvi. 3.

²² Gal. i. 22; 1 Cor. xvi. 19; 2 Cor. viii. 2.

God," and a "Church of Christ." Each local church is a unity, a body of Christ, a spiritual Israel. He recognizes the danger of schism, and constantly combats it.²⁸ The local flock is the city community; its pastors are not mere individuals endowed with extraordinary *charismata*, but a corporate body presiding over a legal unit.

Every such community has within it a local jurisdiction. We see this in the passages which deal with the pastoral charge, in the reference to excommunication in St. Matthew and First Corinthians, and in the action of the elders of Jerusalem, who sat and voted with the Apostles in the first Christian council. "Take heed to the whole flock, wherein the Holy Ghost hath placed you," says St. Paul to the elders of Ephesus, thus plainly indicating that these elders were not merely delegates of the Apostles, but held their authority directly from God. St. Paul founded the community and placed it on a working basis, but God supplied the necessary authority. This ordinary jurisdiction, residing in a local church, is the basis of the diocesan jurisdiction, which figures so largely in canon law; for the city communities of apostolic times were the dioceses of the period.

Besides this local unity there was also a universal unity, a Church Catholic, composed of all the churches. The basis of this catholic unity was universal baptism, universal faith in Jesus, and the uni-

²⁸ 1 Cor. i. 11-13.

versal mission and authority of the Apostles.²⁴ The idea of a universal and visible Church is well set forth in the words of St. Paul, who says “that the Gentiles should be fellow-heirs, and of the same body, and co-partners of his promise in Christ Jesus, by the Gospel. . . . To me is given this grace to preach among the Gentiles, the unsearchable riches of Christ, and to enlighten all men, that they may see what is the dispensation of the mystery which hath been hidden from eternity in God.”²⁵ The same notion of a universal unity is expressed in the Epistle to the Romans, where the Gentiles are spoken of as branches broken from a wild species, and grafted into the olive tree; and all become partakers of the sap of the same root. The Universal Church is not a number of bodies in Christ, but one body only; for Christ is not divided.²⁶ It is through this society that men are to seek the kingdom of God. “What shall we do?” say the Jews to St. Peter after listening to his first sermon. “Do penance, believe, and be baptized,” is his answer. And St. John repeats the same teaching: “That which we have seen and have heard, we declare to you, that you also may have fellowship with us; and our fellowship is with the Father, and with His Son, Jesus Christ.”²⁷

Baptism with St. Paul has two significations. It

²⁴ Gal. iii. 29; Eph. iv. 11, 12.

²⁵ Eph. iii. 6-9.

²⁶ Eph. i. 22; 1 Cor. i.

²⁷ John i. 3.

is the source of sanctification ²⁸ and the rite of initiation into the visible Church.²⁹ As all must receive baptism, so all must be incorporated into the body of Christ. This body is not an invisible Church of the just, as Luther taught in the sixteenth century, or as Sohm teaches in the twentieth, but a visible society, having different classes of visible members, such as prophets, teachers, and evangelists.

St. Paul never expressly treats of the relation between the particular and the Universal Church, and at times it is difficult to determine which Church he has in view. The local Church is the Body of Christ, and the Church of God; the Universal Church is also the Body of Christ and the Church of God. A member of the local Church is by the very fact a member of the Universal Church, because membership in both is acquired by baptism.

There is not a single passage in all the New Testament which upholds the theory of Dr. Hatch, viz., that association among those who believed was a matter of free choice in the primitive Church. For St. Paul is ever insisting upon the fact that Christians form a Body of Christ—a visible body which one enters by the sacrament of baptism. He describes in detail its various members, apostles, prophets, teachers, wonder-workers, and simple faithful; all are members of the body and of one another. If associ-

²⁸ Eph. v. 27; 1 Cor. xii. 13; Gal. vi. 15.

²⁹ 1 Cor. xii.

ation is not a primary duty of the Christian life, then we are not baptized into the visible mystical body of Christ; and it is mere idealism on St. Paul's part to think we are. The very texts that Dr. Hatch quotes refute his thesis. He speaks of those "who separate themselves," citing the Epistle of St. Jude. But he fails to see that the Apostle condemns their schism, declaring them "sensual men, having not the Spirit." Dr. Hatch might just as well cite the schisms at Corinth to prove that unity was not required in the local churches, or the intrigues of the Judaizers to prove that Christianity was but a new phase of the Mosaic law.

In many places of the ancient world the government was originally in the hands of a council composed of the heads of families. Traces of this primitive system survived in the Senate in Rome, in the Gerousia of Sparta, and in the Sanhedrim of the Jews. Given this senatorial method of communal government among both Jews and Gentiles, it was natural that the first Christian communities should be organized on the same plan. Speaking of St. Paul and St. Barnabas, St. Luke tells us that returning from their first apostolic journey, "they confirmed the souls of the disciples, and exhorted them to continue in the faith . . . and when they had ordained to them elders in every church and had prayed with fasting, they commended them to the Lord."⁸⁰ St.

⁸⁰ Acts xiv. 20-22.

Paul followed the same plan upon his subsequent missions. Elders are spoken of at Jerusalem and in the church of Pontus, Galatia, Asia, Cappadocia, Bithynia, Crete, and the Jewish communities of the dispersion.⁸¹ The letters of Clement, Polycarp, and Ignatius prove beyond doubt that the presbyteral college was a universal institution before the close of the apostolic period. St. Luke tells us that St. Paul and St. Barnabas were sent to carry alms from Antioch to the elders at Jerusalem,⁸² though he says nothing of the appointment of these elders or of their position in the community. We know, however, that these elders were superiors of some kind in the Church. At the Council of Jerusalem, we find the Apostles and the elders assembled to discuss the question raised by the Judaizers, viz., that salvation could not be obtained without circumcision. This Council was held in the presence of all the faithful, but it is clear that the Apostles and elders alone were judges in the matter. There is no evidence whatever for the theory of Dr. Lindsay, that the authority in the early Christian communities was democratic. It is true that the laity were allowed great latitude in the matter of elections. The seven deacons were elected by popular vote at Jerusalem, although their ordination was reserved to the Apostles. The bishops were similarly elected as late as the third century. In general, the assembly had a voice in all matters of pru-

⁸¹ 1 Peter i. 1; v. 1; James v; Titus i. 5.

⁸² Acts xi. 28-30.

dence and consultation, but never in the deciding of dogmatic questions nor in the interpreting of the Divine Law.

It is clear from the Council of Jerusalem that the elders held a magisterial and legislative jurisdiction; their title was not merely a title of honor, but an ecclesiastical office. Again, we read of the elders discussing with St. Paul the state of affairs at Jerusalem as fathers of the community,³³ and of their anointing the sick with oil in the name of the Lord in the Epistle of St. James.³⁴ Both these instances prove that the elders were a ruling order in the community. They consulted for the peace and edification of the community, administered its financial resources, enjoyed a magisterial jurisdiction, and ministered at least some of the sacraments to the faithful.

The position of the elders in the Pauline Churches is set forth in St. Paul's discourse to the elders of Ephesus.³⁵ They are the spiritual superiors of the local church; they are shepherds feeding and overseeing the flocks; their magisterial authority occupies the foremost place in the discourse; they have been placed by the Holy Ghost as stewards in the Church to oversee the faithful. At Jerusalem the elders decide a question of faith; in Ephesus we find them teaching the Gospel preached to them by St. Paul. In his letter to Timothy³⁶ the Apostle speaks of the elders laboring zealously in the word and in teaching.

³³ Acts xxi. 23, 24.
³⁴ James v. 14, 15.

³⁵ Acts xx. 28-31.
³⁶ 1 Tim. v. 17-22.

St. Peter tells us that the elders of Asia Minor possessed equal powers with the elders of Jerusalem and the Pauline Churches.⁸⁷ They are pastors or shepherds of the flock; they direct and govern with authority; they are the representatives of the Prince of Pastors in the local community. St. Clement of Rome, in his letters to Corinth, writes a strong defense of the elders of that city, who had been unjustly removed from their ministry in a "detestable sedition." The elders of Corinth are ecclesiastical rulers, successors of the Apostles, pastors of the flock of Christ, and duly constituted in authority. The whole New Testament negatives the thesis of those modern writers who maintain that the presbyterate was not an office in the primitive Church, but merely an honorary position.⁸⁸

Before the death of the Apostles there existed in every Christian community a body of overseers (bishops). These overseers were ecclesiastical superiors; they were appointed for life; they exercised their jurisdiction in virtue of an authority derived from God, through Christ and His Apostles. They were pastors, who enjoyed a legislative, judicial, and a magisterial authority. They also exercised a liturgical function, the essence of which was the celebration of the Eucharist. They probably controlled the administration of the public alms. St. Paul calls the

⁸⁷ 1 Peter v. 1 *et seq.*

⁸⁸ Cf. 1 Thess. v. 12, 13; 1 Cor. xvi. 15-18; Rom. xii. 4-8; Heb. xiii. 7, 17.

elders of Ephesus overseers, placed by the Holy Ghost to shepherd the Church of God.³⁹ They by divine right are to direct their local flock according to the received doctrine, and to guard it "from rapacious wolves, who utter perverse things." In his letter to Timothy,⁴⁰ St. Paul describes at great length the office of overseer, and the virtues required in candidates for the episcopate. The episcopate is not merely a title of honor, but an office, a good work. The candidate must not be a neophyte, nor twice married; he must be prudent, a teacher, a man of hospitality, chaste, sober, modest, gentle, etc.⁴¹ The Epistle to Titus brings out more clearly the teaching office of the bishop. The chief duty is "to exhort in sound doctrine, and to convince the gain-sayers."

St. Peter plainly speaks of the overseers as ecclesiastical superiors, who exercise the pastoral charge, and shepherd the flock by overseeing it.⁴² Their authority is a local authority. St. Peter insists on the same qualifications as St. Paul; he condemns the same faults.

The Epistle of St. Clement mentions the divine origin and universality of the episcopate. We read: "The Apostles received the Gospel for us from Jesus Christ; Jesus Christ was sent forth from God. So Christ is from God, and the Apostles from Christ. . . . Preaching everywhere in country and town, they

³⁹ Acts xx. 28.

⁴⁰ 1 Tim. iii. 1-7.

⁴¹ Titus i. 7-9.

⁴² 1 Peter v. 2.

(the Apostles) appointed their first fruits to be overseers and deacons unto those that should believe.” This is a clear and explicit testimony from one who wrote only thirty years after the death of St. Paul. The writer speaks in the name of the Roman Church, which must certainly have known of the organization set up by the Apostles throughout Christendom. Moreover, he wrote to the Church of Corinth, which held direct relationship with all the other Pauline churches, and in which St. Paul himself had lived for eighteen months. St. Clement proves conclusively that the bishops have a divine right to rule, and that, therefore, the people have no right whatever to set them aside. He also incidentally alludes to the bishop’s right of consecrating the Eucharist, *i. e.*, “to offer the gifts blamelessly and holily.”

The *Didache*, or *The Doctrine of the Twelve Apostles*,⁴⁸ says: “On the Lord’s Day, gather yourselves together, break bread and give thanks, first confessing your sins, that your sacrifice may be pure. . . . Elect for yourselves, therefore, overseers and deacons worthy of the law,” etc. The writer clearly considers the Eucharist a sacrifice, and consequently urges the election of worthy overseers to offer up this sacrifice to the Lord. The overseer must be meek, disinterested, truthful and approved. His teaching must be tested by the rule of tradition, for “whoever shall come and teach you those things that have been said before, receive him; but if the teacher himself

⁴⁸ XIV; XVI.

be perverted and teach a different doctrine to the destruction thereof, hear him not."

Some rationalistic scholars, like Harnack and Réville, have argued from the *Didache* that the ministry of the word did not originally belong to the local superiors, but was taken over by them gradually as the prophets died out. But as a matter of fact, the *Didache* gives not the slightest hint that the local elders or bishops were encroaching on the domain of the prophets, or that the prophets were dying out at this time. The episcopate was an office from the beginning of Christianity, whereas prophecy was never more than a gift or *charisma*. The bishops taught in virtue of the power given them by the Holy Ghost, whereas the prophets taught merely as an instrument of revelation.

There is no proof in the New Testament or in primitive writers of Dr. Hatch's theory of a purely administrative episcopate. In all the first century documents, which refer to overseers, there are many references to their functions as pastors, teachers, and liturgical ministers, but not one reference to their being financial administrators. History proves that it was in this very matter of money, which Dr. Hatch considers essential, that temptations were greatest; yet the New Testament writers insist on every qualification in episcopal candidates, except that of a good administrator.

We learn from St. Paul, the *Didache*, St. Polycarp, St. Ignatius, and St. Clement that the deacons as-

sisted the overseers in all the episcopal functions, in discipline, teaching, liturgy, and administration. When a deacon preaches at the present day, he does so in virtue of the authority delegated to him by the bishop. But it does not seem to have been so in the beginning. In Jerusalem the deacons were the first localized superiors, and therefore must either have held to a certain extent the ordinary jurisdiction of the church or diocese, or have labored with the authority delegated to them by the Apostles. With the imposition of hands, they seemed to have received orders and jurisdiction for their higher duties.

As far as we can trace the appointment to ecclesiastical office in apostolic times, we find everywhere the same theory: all power comes from Christ by transmission, and the instrument of transmission is imposition of hands.⁴⁴

When St. Paul tells Titus "to establish elders in all the cities of Crete," he evidently orders him to organize a diocesan church in every city, as St. Paul himself had done in the provinces of Cilicia, Asia, and Macedonia. Titus is therefore not a diocesan bishop, but an apostolic delegate, exercising a super-episcopal jurisdiction over all the churches of Crete. It is very probable that Timothy in like manner was not the diocesan bishop of Ephesus, but a legate exercising an authority over all or the greater part of Proconsular Asia. We know, moreover, that St. Paul sent his dis-

⁴⁴ Acts vi; xiv. 22; Titus i; 1 Tim. iii; v. 22; Acts xiii; 2 Tim. i. 6.

ciples to exercise similar missions in Corinth, Philippi, Thessalonica, Galatia, and Dalmatia. Often these legates were sent not to an individual church, but to a whole province. Even when a city is mentioned, it is usually the metropolis of a large district, so that even in this case the legate's jurisdiction was much wider than that of the local clergy.

As far as we can judge from the evidence at hand, the elders were not generally allowed to ordain candidates for office. Ordination, when necessary, seems to have been conferred by St. Paul or his disciples during their frequent visits to the Christian communities. In the matter of jurisdiction, however, the elders appeared to have enjoyed true episcopal authority, if not individually, at least as a corporate body.

In the churches founded by St. Paul there is no certain trace of a monarchical bishop before the death of the Apostle. All the documents speak only of a hierarchy of two grades, overseers and deacons, but not one word of a diocesan, monarchical episcopate. As late as the middle of the second century, many of the Roman provinces possessed only a single monarchical bishop. About the time of St. Ignatius, the monarchical episcopate was practically confined to the Pauline Churches of Asia Minor, and the four great patriarchal sees. But while St. Paul lived, all the churches of Asia Minor were governed by a corporate jurisdiction.

St. Jerome, in his commentary of the Epistle of

Titus, maintains that the words presbyter and bishop are synonymous in the New Testament; the first presbyters therefore were bishops. Each church was ruled by a college of these presbyter-bishops in the beginning; but the monarchical was afterwards substituted for the collegiate episcopate under stress of circumstances. The change was made by a law of the Universal Church, which took the shape of a binding custom. In his own day bishops were superior to presbyters, not only in jurisdiction, but also in orders.

Some non-Catholic scholars maintain that the magisterial authority of the local clergy arose from the fact that they assumed the ministry of the prophets, but the texts cited by no means prove their point. There is no evidence, either in apostolic or sub-apostolic times, to show that the prophets ever enjoyed any jurisdiction. The prophetic ministry, according to St. Paul, was a means of edification, but never a pastorate of the flock. The presbyter-bishops were appointed by the Holy Ghost to teach in the name of Christ, whereas the prophets always claimed a hearing on the basis of immediate inspiration. The two ministries, therefore, were totally different in kind. The prophetic was based on an extraordinary *charisma*; the pastoral on a divine authority transmitted from Christ through the Apostles. The ministry of the prophets practically disappeared before the end of the first century. As the Church became well established, its necessity was no longer felt, and

the abuses to which it was liable, either from false prophets or from disagreement with local superiors, soon rendered it unnecessary and even hurtful to the religious life of the Church.

CHRISTIANITY AND THE ROMAN LAW¹

CHARLES BOUCAUD, the eminent professor of the Catholic University of Lyons, has written a most interesting study on the beginnings of the canon law, and the changes effected in the old Roman law by the teachings of Christianity. As early as 1837 Frédéric Ozanam wrote an article in the *Univers* calling attention to the political and intellectual influence of Christianity upon the science of law. Later on, in his *History of the Civilization of the Fifth Century*, he gave an excellent outline of the history of the Roman law, making special mention of the Christian spirit manifested in the laws of the first Christian emperors. About the same time, the eminent French jurisconsult Troplong published at Paris (1843) a work entitled *The Influence of Christianity on the Roman Civil Law*. In this brochure he showed how the teachings of Christianity had transformed the juridical ideas of ancient Rome. His general thesis was bitterly contested by the historic school, particularly by Padeletti. Indeed, for many years it was commonly taught in the schools that the Roman law was practically unaffected by early Christianity.

¹ *La Première Ébauche d'un Droit Chrétien dans le Droit Romain.* By Charles Boucaud. Paris: A. Tralin.

The thesis of Ozanam has been taken up again in our own days, and defended by three eminent Italian professors, Ferrini of the University of Pavia, Riccobono of the University of Palermo, and Carusi of Rome. In 1894 Ferrini published an essay on *The Legal Knowledge of Arnobius and Lactantius*. Carusi followed with a comparative study of the early Fathers of the Church and the Roman jurisconsults (*Diritto Romano e Patristica*), while Riccobono in 1911 studied the influence of Christianity upon the Roman law of the sixth century (*Cristianesimo e Diritto Privato*). Their chief antagonist was Baviera, a professor in the University of Naples, who maintained that the moral, religious, and doctrinal principles of the Gospel had not exercised any influence whatever upon the juridical institutions of the Romans, except perhaps in the field of public charity, which Christianity organized; that even Justinian's legislation against divorce was inspired more by the policy of Augustus than by the teaching of the Fathers of the Church; that slavery was not modified in any essential manner by Christian principles; that the continued struggle in the Lower Empire in favor of the weak against the strong was prompted solely by the exigencies of everyday life, and the demands of pauperism. Of course, we must remember that Baviera's conclusions were affected by his rationalism. In his viewpoint, Christian morals and law are two parallel lines that never meet. Their objects are different; the one refers solely to the future life,

while the other has to do with everyday practical life, especially in its economic aspect. He upholds an independent morality, and declares that the moral teaching of our Saviour is totally distinct from the moral teaching of St. Paul and of St. Augustine. Christianity owes its origin to the popular despair that characterized the times of Herod, and this despair made the people look solely to the other life for the happy reign of the poor and the humble.

It is not our purpose to refute here the erroneous views of Baviera on the origin and development of Christianity. Let us simply state that the Christianity of St. Paul and the Fathers of the Church is identical with the teaching of Jesus; that whereas the Church assimilated all that was good in the Greco-Roman civilization of the time, it was primarily and essentially a divine teaching and a revelation. It was not merely a heavenly hope born of a disgust with earthly conditions, but a supernatural religion taught by the Son of God, Jesus Christ. It is false to maintain that because the Christian has ever in view the life to come as the reward of his loyalty to God's law, that therefore he is totally indifferent to the things of this life. He does not declare that justice is to reign only in the hereafter, but he endeavors, as far as possible, to bring it about even in this imperfect world. Morality is not independent of religion, nor is morality independent of law. *A priori* we are certain that the principles of Christian morality must influence in a special manner the laws of a Christian

community, and historically we can prove that they have done so.

That the historical problem is a difficult one, we are ready to admit. For, in the first place, it is hard to determine whether the development of natural law and equity in the Roman law was due to Christianity alone, or to the influence of the Stoic philosophy, which had certainly influenced the classic jurisconsults of an earlier period. In the second place, it is hard to determine whether the reforms of the Christian emperors were prompted by the Gospel, or merely by political necessity.

We may distinguish three different stages in the influence of Christianity upon the Roman law: The first period lasted until the end of the third century, during which the Gospel teachings were rapidly spreading, although their influence upon the Roman law was only indirect. The second period lasted from the end of the third century until the middle of the fifth. Christianity had now become the official religion of the State, and consequently directly affected the Roman civilization of the time. The Theodosian Code, promulgated by the Emperors Theodosius II and Valentinian III in 438, clearly witnessed to the growing influence of the Gospel. The third period extended to the time of Justinian in the sixth century, and was undoubtedly a time of triumph for Christian principles.

First Period. Every student of early Church history knows of the remarkable spread of Christianity

during the first three centuries. Even before the time of Constantine, we read of certain emperors being favorable to the new religion, or of having embraced it. Hadrian is praised by both St. Justin and St. Melito of Sardis for publishing an edict that was favorable to the Christians. Septimius Severus had his son Antoninus Caracalla educated by the Christian Proculus, and is praised by Tertullian for having opposed the pagan demand for persecuting the Christians. Eusebius tells us that Philip the Arab (244-249) was a Christian. Alexander Severus was most friendly to the Christians, and was one time on the point of erecting a temple in honor of Christ. Perhaps it is a mere coincidence, but the fact is certain that the best epoch of the Roman law was precisely the reigns of the Severi and the Antonines. The ideas of justice and equity professed by the eminent Roman lawyers of the third century, had been held by Christians for over a century and a half. It is, therefore, highly probable that Christianity had something to do with the betterment of the Roman law of this time, especially as we notice a great setback during the reign of Julian the Apostate.

Second Period. On October 28, 312, Constantine won the famous battle of the Milvian Bridge. Two months afterwards he published the famous edict of Milan, which established liberty of worship, and put an end to the ostracism of the Christian Church. The emperor at once proceeded to make the laws of the empire accord with the principles of the Gospel,

without, however, doing too much violence to long-established traditions. His legal and social reforms were thus praised in 321 by the pagan Nazarius: "New laws were established to maintain a high standard of morality and to combat vice. He set aside many of the old legal technicalities of procedure, which were a source of injury to the poor and simple. He upheld decency and strengthened the marriage bond."

Following the teaching of St. Paul in the sixth chapter of First Corinthians, the early Christians submitted their differences to the bishops, and did not appeal to the law courts. Under Constantine this Christian custom was sanctioned by the civil law. An imperial constitution, ascribed to Constantine but probably apocryphal, compelled the civil magistrates to hand over a law case to the bishop on demand of one of the litigants, and in such a case the bishop's decision was without appeal. This extraordinary power was done away with by succeeding emperors, who referred to the bishops only those cases that concerned the clergy or religious affairs. This was the origin of the ecclesiastical jurisdiction that prevailed all throughout the Middle Ages. In other matters, the bishop could be appointed arbitrator only on the demand of both litigants. The bishops, according to St. Augustine, were soon overwhelmed with cases; in fact they became the usual defenders and advocates of the weak, captives, widows, and orphans. In 368 the Emperors Valens and Valentinian decreed that

the bishops should take good care that the merchants did not raise the price of their goods to the detriment of the poor; another time we find the Emperors Leo and Anthemius enacting a law empowering the bishops to see that the soldiers obtained the rations allotted to them, and that the insane and the orphans were provided with tutors and guardians.

Georges Goyau, in his book, *The Vatican, the Popes and Civilization*, has clearly shown the social rôle played by the Church at that time. He writes: "The Church at that epoch answered all the needs of society; she set in order the disorganized Empire; she substituted order for a state of anarchy. . . . It was by entering into the very life of the people that she conquered them. The men of that day did not regard her merely as a consoler, who promised them another life to offset their present misery, and to appease their desire of happiness. She was not exclusively a guide to a good death. On the contrary . . . the Church, while telling men that they did not live by bread alone, saw to it that they had bread enough to eat."

St. Ambrose, the counselor of the young Emperor Gratian, and the author of a treatise on Roman law, certainly inspired the legislation of the Emperor with the Christian spirit, and later on by bringing the Emperor Theodosius to his knees, was indirectly responsible for the changes in the Roman law made by him after he had fulfilled his penance.

Third Period. The Christianizing of the Roman

law reached its full development under the Emperor Justinian in the sixth century. The *Corpus Juris Civilis* has been compared to the Bible for its influence on the history of Christian civilization. The law codified by Justinian was essentially different from the law set forth by the jurisconsults of the first three centuries. It was promulgated in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ, and under the auspices of Almighty God; it spoke plainly of divine providence and of the sovereign Trinity; the imprint of the Gospel teaching was evident on nearly every page. Justinian was not a mere compiler of the old Roman law; he was in a true sense a legislator, who wished to breathe a new spirit into the pagan code of the old classic jurisconsults. Despite its technical perfection, the pagan code knew nothing of the piety, humanity, and benignity which characterized the Justinian code; its crude individualism was utterly alien to the Christian idea of charity and brotherly love, and the Christian notion of the paramount importance of the general interests and the common good.

The first reform to which we call attention is the change in the very notion of right. The Romans had as a maxim: *qui suo jure utitur neminem laedit*. Justinian changed this, so that in future no one could exercise a right which necessarily implied any injury to his neighbor. The old idea of the sovereign being exempt from all law² ceased with the Gospel. We find the Emperors Theodosius II and Valentinian III

² *Princeps legibus solutus est.*

proclaiming humbly in 429: "The dignity of the sovereign requires him to acknowledge that he is subject to law. Our power is merely the power of the law; it is much nobler to submit to the law than to command others to obey it. Our aim in the present edict, therefore, is to make others know what we forbid ourselves doing." The same principle is voiced by the Emperors Leo and Anthemius: "A good prince," they say, "believes that he can do only what is allowed to individual citizens; and, if he is liberal, he wishes to be so according to law," etc.

The imperial constitutions of the Lower Empire insist upon the divine origin of sovereignty, and teach unequivocally the religious and social duties of the State. They regard authority as a sacred deposit which the prince is bound to use for the good of the people and the benefit of the weak. They are very much concerned about having the laws of the State and the laws of the Church agree. They trace the origin of the civil laws to the disobedience of men to the laws of God.

It is not at all surprising, therefore, to find the first elements of social polity in the Roman law of the Lower Empire. We call special attention to the legislation regarding the Sunday rest, inaugurated by Constantine and continued by his successors; the regulation of the brutal law of supply and demand through the arbitration of the bishops; the first attempts at State help in the matter of hospitals, free medical services, and the like. Under the old Roman law a

slave was a *thing*, not a person, to be classed with horses, cows, and mules. Under the influence of Christianity, he became a person with certain well-defined rights. While the Church did not abolish slavery directly, she taught principles, like the equality of all men in the sight of God and Christ Jesus, which eventually drove it out of the Christian commonwealth. Constantine was the first to decree that the master who killed his slave was guilty of murder; he forbade a master to expose the children of slaves; he prohibited the cold-blooded separation of the members of a slave's family; he permitted laymen to set their slaves free in the presence of the priest in Church, and clerics to enfranchise them without any formality whatever. Justinian in like manner passed many laws in their favor. He abolished all the old restrictions of the laws *Fufia Caninia*, *Ælia Sentia*, and *Junia*, regarding enfranchisement, and did away with the social inferiority which hitherto had characterized them; they were to have a liberty "pure, spotless, and perfect." He prohibited non-Catholics from possessing Christian slaves; he abolished the *servitus poenae*, which reduced criminals to slavery, and the law of Claudian which punished with slavery a free woman who had immoral relations with a slave; he settled the old controversy about the freeing of a slave who belonged to different masters. Leo the Philosopher freed the man who had sold himself into slavery under false pretenses, and safeguarded the marriage of a slave and a free person. Alexis Com-

nenus made it easy for a slave to obtain his freedom even against his master's will, and recognized the validity of his marriage.

The Church had fought for the indissolubility of the marriage bond by the clear explicit teaching of her Fathers and the censures of her Councils. "Different are the laws of Cæsar and the laws of Christ; different the teaching of Papinian and of St. Paul," wrote St. Jerome, apropos of divorce permitted by the Roman law. Not content with condemning divorce, the Church did her utmost to make the State declare in favor of the indissolubility of marriage. The Council of Mileve, for example, demanded of the emperor new legislation on marriage more in accord with the teaching of the Gospel. Constantine limited the number of legal causes for divorce, and his example was followed by succeeding emperors like Theodosius and Justinian.

We may mention in passing many other reforms passed under the inspiration of the Gospel teaching. The Christian emperors protected the rights of children of a first marriage when the father married again; they frowned down upon illegitimacy; they protected children against the parental despotism of the old Roman law; they abolished the old pagan laws enacted to discourage celibacy; they accorded to the widow a fourth of her deceased husband's property; they favored pious foundations and works of charity; they mitigated the severity of the prisons, and abol-

ished some of the harshest penalties of the criminal code.

St. Gregory has been rightly styled the founder of mediæval Christian Europe, and the founder of the Church's canon law. Non-Catholic historians like Dudden consider him one of the most notable figures in ecclesiastical history. He says of him: "He exercised in many respects a momentous influence. . . . To him we must look for an explanation of the religious situation of the Middle Ages; indeed, if no account were taken of his work, the evolution of the form of mediæval Christianity would be almost inexplicable." We are not concerned here with his liturgical reforms, his missionary activity, his political foresight, or his fostering of monasticism. We merely call attention to his social influence as one of the richest landowners of the period. In his time the total area of the States of the Church were from thirteen hundred to eighteen hundred square miles, and the income he derived from them was about \$1,500,000 a year. As his biographer John the Deacon put it, "the Church had become the granary of the world." He had agents everywhere, in Italy, Gaul, Africa, Corsica, Sicily, and Dalmatia, who rendered an account to him regularly of every *modius* of corn and every *solidus* paid by his farmers. He tells the bishops of his time that "they were to be responsible not only for the salvation of souls, but for the temporal good of all the people under their charge." In all

his letters he continually speaks of this vast property as the patrimony of the poor, and urges his agents never to augment their revenue at the expense of the poor. The bishops are to divide their income into four parts: First, for the maintenance of the bishop's house and the requirements of hospitality; second, for the clergy; third, for the poor, and fourth, for the upkeep of the Churches. Nothing was too small to escape his notice. We find him writing about the wages of the shepherds, the selling and breeding of cattle, the injustice of some of his officers towards the peasants, colonists, and slaves, and the wickedness of burdensome rents and usury. Ever and always he is, as Pope Pius X calls him in his encyclical *Jucunda sane*, "the defender of social justice," or as John the Deacon put it, "the *prudentissimus paterfamilias Christi*."

His teaching on riches is scattered throughout his homilies, his letters, his morals, and his *liber pastoralis curae*. In the first place, he sets forth in eloquent words the mystic beauty of poverty, and denounces most vehemently the avarice of the proud rich. He next defends the lawfulness of private ownership. He tells us not to confound private ownership with the love of riches. One can be rich without being attached to the goods of this life, although the true Christian must ever be detached in spirit. We read of his protest to the Empress against the injustice done to owners of property in Corsica and Sardinia, and his defense of the Jews against the anti-Semitism

of his time. Lastly, he never fails to insist upon the duties of the rich man towards the poor. Almsgiving is a rigorous obligation, which our Lord has sanctioned by an everlasting reward. In a striking passage of his *Morals*, he says that “the poor are not the clients of the rich, but the rich are the mystical clients of the poor, depending upon their friendship to attain eternal life.” The only reproach ever made to Pope Gregory was that he emptied the treasury of the Church by his excessive benefactions. This is proof enough that he carried out his principles in practice.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Sumner-Mayne—*Études sur l'Histoire du Droit*.
Beach—*Le Droit Civil en Amerique*.
Demangeat—*Cours de Droit Romain*.
Carusi—*Diritto Romano e Patristica*.
Riccobono—*Cristianesimo e Diritto Privato*.
Ferrini—*Storia delle fonti del Diritto*.
Baviera—*Concetto e Limiti dell' Influenza del Cristianesimo sul Diritto Romano*.
Lactantius—*Institutiones Divinæ*.
Rivalta—*Diritto Romano e Positivo*.
De Broglie—*L'Église et l'Empire Romain au IV Siècle*.
Claudio Jannet—*Les Grandes Epoques de l'Histoire Économique*.
Godefroy Kurth—*Les Origines de la Civilisation Moderne*.
Ozanam—*Mélanges*.
Ozanam—*Histoire de la Civilisation au V Siècle*.
Troplong—*L'Influence du Christianisme sur le Droit Civil des Romains*.
Hervé-Bazin—*Les Grandes Journées de la Chrétienté*.
Edouard Cuq.—*Les Institutions Juridiques des Romains*.
Goyau—*Le Vatican, les Papes, et la Civilisation*.

70 STUDIES IN CHURCH HISTORY

Ihering—*Histoire du Développment du Droit Romain.*

Allard—*Les Esclaves Chrétiens.*

Dudden—*St. Gregory the Great.*

THE ASSUMPTION OF THE BLESSED VIRGIN¹

THE term Assumption in Catholic theology connotes three distinct things, viz., the death of the Blessed Virgin; her resurrection soon after death; and her entrance, body and soul, into heaven. In Christian antiquity, the terms used to signify the Feast of the Assumption—*dormitio* (sleeping), *pausatio* (pause), *transitus* (passing to eternity), *depositio* (placing in the grave)—emphasized particularly the fact of the Blessed Virgin's death, although by metonymy they also designated her resurrection and assumption. The words in themselves prove nothing against the doctrine, for as late as the fifteenth century, when no one questioned the Assumption, ecclesiastical writers were still using the term *dormitio*. We must remember, too, that in primitive Christianity the word *assumptio* was frequently used to designate the death of the saints, especially of the martyrs, as we may read in the *Hieronymian Martyrology*. At the present time, the word *assumptio*² is used exclusively to designate the Blessed Virgin's entrance into heaven, body and soul. It is employed in direct contrast to

¹ *La Doctrine de l'Assomption de la T. S. Vierge—Sa Définition comme Dogme de Foi Divine Catholique.* By D. Paul Renaudin. Paris: Pierre Téqui.

² Mark xvi. 19; Acts i. 2, 11, 22.

the active term *ascensio*, which signifies our Lord's bodily entrance into heaven of His own divine power. His Mother's assumption was due solely to the power of Almighty God.

It is universally held to-day that the Blessed Virgin died before she was assumed into heaven. St. Epiphanius (+ 403) is the only one of the early Fathers who is uncertain on this point, for he says: "I say not that she did not die, yet I am not certain that she did die."⁸ A few theologians, moreover, in the seventeenth and nineteenth centuries, held that she did not die because of her Immaculate Conception, but they had little or no following.

When and where the Blessed Virgin died are matters of mere conjecture. The dates assigned for her death—A. D. 41–48—rest on no sure historical foundation. Both Ephesus and Jerusalem claim to be her place of burial. The scholars who declare for Ephesus, point to the fact that Our Lord from the cross confided His Mother to St. John, and rely on a false rendering of a very obscure text of the Synodal letter of the Council of Ephesus in 431. In very recent times, Monsignor Timoni, Archbishop of Smyrna, and others quote confidently the rather doubtful discovery of the house of the Blessed Virgin unearthed at Panaghai Capouli, near Ephesus. The scholars who declare for Jerusalem, rely upon a number of apocryphal writings which are valuable for their antiquity and unanimity, the accounts of ancient pilgrimages,

⁸ *Adv. Hær.*, 78.

such as the itinerary of Antoninus of Piacenza, and some other testimonies of the sixth, seventh, and eighth centuries. The Jerusalem tradition is two-fold, some authorities favoring Gethsemani on the Mount of Olives, and others the house of the Cenacle in Jerusalem itself.

It is only in the second half of the sixth century, that we meet with the first authentic and unquestioned documents, treating of the doctrine of the Assumption. It is true that there are a great number of apocryphal writings of the first five centuries that mention both the doctrine and the feast, but scholars to-day are unanimous in declaring these references interpolations of a later date, or pseudo-writings of periods as late as the twelfth century, full of imaginary and legendary details. The chief of these apocrypha are as follows:

Prior to the Council of Ephesus: *The Gospel of the Twelve Apostles*; *The Death of the Virgin*, by Leucius, a pseudo-companion of the Apostles; and a Syriac work, *The Obsequies of the Holy Virgin*, fragments of which have been published by Dr. Wright in 1865.

After the Council of Ephesus: A Coptic text, published by Zoego in his *Catalogus Codicum Copticorum*; the *Gospels of the pseudo-Gamaliel and St. Bartholomew*; the *De Transitu Mariæ Virginis* of the fifth century, attributed to St. Melito of Sardis (+ 194); the fifth century accounts attributed to St. John (*De Obitu Sanctæ Dominae*), to St. Joseph of Arimathea,

and to St. Dionysius the Areopagite (*De Divinis Nominibus*) ; the interpolation in the *Chronicle of Eusebius*, which is not found in the oldest manuscripts ; the recently-discovered *Letter of St. Dionysius* to Bishop Titus, which Nirschl has rather arbitrarily dated 363 A. D. ; a *Sermon of St. Jerome*, probably of the twelfth century, although Archbishop Hincmar defended its authenticity against a monk of Corbie ; a *Sermon of St. Augustine (De Assumptione)* of the twelfth century, and a *Treatise on the Assumption*, which is probably the work of Fulbert of Chartres (+ 1029).

The principal authority for the details of the Blessed Virgin's death is St. John Damascene (+ circ. 760), who tells us that he relies on the authority of a certain unknown writer, Euthymius. Pulcheria, the wife of the Emperor Marcion (450-457), had erected a Church of Our Lady in a suburb of Constantinople known as Blachernae. Wishing to bury the body of the Blessed Virgin there, she wrote Bishop Juvenal of Jerusalem to that effect, but he informed her that the body of the Mother of God was not to be found in his episcopal city. She had indeed been buried in the Garden of Gethsemani, in the presence of all the Apostles save St. Thomas. He arrived three days after the burial, and wishing to venerate the body of the Blessed Virgin, had the tomb opened. The tomb was found empty, save for the linen grave clothes, which emitted a fragrant perfume. Whereupon the Apostles concluded that the Lord had taken up her body

with Him into heaven.⁴ All scholars regard this account as purely legendary, especially as Bishop Juvenal was an adept at forgery. His literary dishonesty was most bitterly denounced by Pope Leo I in a letter to Maximus of Antioch.⁵

Rationalistic critics like Renan⁶ have often asserted that the Catholic belief in the Assumption depended entirely upon these apocryphal and legendary writings. This is not the fact. The Church has never drawn her teaching from such impure sources. On the contrary, she has utterly ignored and distrusted them, forbidding, in the so-called Decree of Gelasius, the faithful even to read the most important of them all, the *De Transitu Mariae* of the pseudo-Melito. Moreover, although she inserted in the office of the fourth day within the Octave of the Assumption, the account of St. John Damascene, which reproduced, as the text declared, "an ancient and very trustworthy tradition," she very carefully suppressed the words "very trustworthy," so as not to vouch for the legendary details connected with the doctrine.

There are two views among Catholic scholars regarding the value and use of these apocryphal writings. Some maintain that they may be cited as an historical proof of the Church's belief at the time of their composition, and, though we may set aside the legendary details, that we are to accept the fact of the Assumption as a doctrine handed down by the

⁴ P. L. xcvi, col. 690.

⁵ P. L. liv., col. 1,044.

⁶ *Origines du Christianisme*, vol. vi, p. 513.

Church's oral tradition. Others hold that it is better to ignore their testimony altogether, until we become more certain of their origin, and date of composition. At any rate, the Church is, in her belief, perfectly independent of these apocryphal documents, and could see them all disappear with the greatest equanimity. For as Dom Renaudin says: "It is not probable that the opinion of an author, more or less trustworthy, originating in the fifth century, could have suddenly spread throughout the East and West, in such a way as to be accepted by Churches widely separated from one another, and to have caused in so many different cities the immediate institution of a solemn feast. Such an agreement could not have been the result of chance. It must have come about through the universal persuasion among the Christian people that the doctrine of the Assumption was officially taught as the authentic teaching of an apostolic oral tradition."⁷

Some one might object that it seems strange the Fathers of the first five centuries are silent about the doctrine of the Assumption. But as St. Augustine said in his treatise on Baptism:⁸ "There are many things that the Universal Church maintains, and that we reasonably believe were preached by the Apostles, although they never have been put in writing." In matters of tradition and belief, prescription in the Church has the force of law, and the providential rule

⁷ *De la Définition Dogmatique de l'Assomption.* Angers, 1900, p. 21.

⁸ V. 23, P. L. xlivi, col. 192.

of doctrinal development permits of a teaching that was implicitly held at one age, being explicitly set forth in the Church's preaching, liturgy, and written testimony of a later age. The dogma of the Immaculate Conception is another instance in point, for there are no explicit testimonies for it in the first few centuries. It became prominent about the same time as the doctrine of the Assumption, *i.e.*, in the sixth century.

Moreover, we may readily conjecture some reasons for the silence of the early Fathers. Perhaps they feared that certain heretics might cite this doctrine in proof of their errors. The Valentinians, for instance, might have used it to confirm their heretical notions about the body of the Saviour, which they thought was formed of a celestial and impassable substance. Perhaps, again, they may have kept the cultus of the Blessed Virgin in the background, because of the people's proneness to idolatry at that time. Besides, in those days of bitter persecution and bitter controversy on the most essential dogmas of the faith, it is easy to see how a subsidiary doctrine like the Assumption might rarely have been mentioned. From what we learn of the clear teaching of the sixth century onwards, we are right in concluding that the only satisfactory explanation of the origin of this doctrine, is the firm conviction of the Church of its being a doctrine handed down by oral tradition from the Apostles.

From the very first days of Christianity there was

an instinctive feeling among Christians that prompted them to celebrate the days on which the martyrs suffered. Later on, the custom spread with regard to other classes of saints, such as virgins, confessors, and the like. The Church naturally met this popular feeling by making these anniversaries public solemnities, or feasts. It would seem natural for the faithful to celebrate in some way the death of the Mother of God, especially after the Council of Ephesus. As most of the ancient feasts originated either at the tomb of a martyr, or at some of the holy places in Palestine, it may be conjectured that the Feast of the Assumption arose near the tomb of the Blessed Virgin at Gethsemani.

One of the earliest feasts we know of "in memory of the Holy and Ever Virgin Mary, Mother of God," was kept at Antioch about the year 380. It commemorated the death of the Blessed Virgin, but said nothing of her Assumption.⁹ In a life of St. Theodosius (+ 529), a monk who lived near Jerusalem in the sixth century, there is mention of a solemn feast of the Blessed Virgin which Baumer conjectures to have been a Feast of the Assumption.¹⁰ He places the date as 507, but gives no reasons for his hypothesis.

The Emperor Maurice (582–602), the friend and contemporary of St. Gregory the Great, is said to have ordered the Feast of the Assumption to be solemnly kept throughout the Empire on the fifteenth of Au-

⁹ Baumstark, *Römische Quartalschrift*, 1897, p. 55.

¹⁰ *Histoire du Bréviaire*, vol. i, p. 267.

gust. Although this fact comes to us on the authority of a Greek historian of the fourteenth century, Nicēphorus Callisti (+ 1341), it is generally accepted as authentic by modern liturgists and historians. He certainly had access to many documents that are now lost.

St. Modestus, Patriarch of Jerusalem (+ 634), is one of the oldest unquestioned testimonies that comes to us from the East. He wrote a panegyric on the Assumption, which, while full of legendary details, bears clear witness to the existence of the feast as early as the seventh century.¹¹

According to Kellner,¹² the feast in the East was certainly older than the sixth century, "for not only the heretical sects, which separated from the Church in the fifth century, such as the Monophysites and the Nestorians, preserved this festival at the time of their separation, but most ancient national Churches, such as the Armenians and the Ethiopians, have it in their calendars."¹³

In the West the most ancient writer to speak of the Assumption is St. Gregory of Tours (+ 593).¹⁴ He writes: "The Lord had the most holy body (of the Virgin) taken into heaven, where, reunited to her soul, it now enjoys, with the elect, happiness without

¹¹ P. G. lxxxvi, cols. 3,277-3,312.

¹² *Heortology*, p. 237.

¹³ The belief in the Assumption was solemnly professed by the Armenian Bishops at the Council of Sis in 1342 (Mansi, 25, 1, 185), and by the Greeks at the Council of Jerusalem in 1672.

¹⁴ *De Gloria Mart.*, i, 109; P. L. xxxi, col. 708.

end. . . . Mary, the glorious Mother of Christ, was taken up into heaven by the Lord, whilst the angelic choirs sang hymns of joy.” In another passage,¹⁵ he tells us that a feast of the Blessed Virgin was solemnly celebrated with a vigil about the middle of the eleventh month, *i. e.*, January. Many believe the feast referred to is the Feast of the Assumption, but others think he alludes to the Feast of the Maternity. The first clear mention of the feast in the West is in the Canons of Bishop Sonnatius of Rheims, which were composed about the year 630.¹⁶ Le Blant¹⁷ has called attention to an inscription of the year 676, which clearly speaks of the feast celebrated on August 15. Other seventh century witnesses of the feast are the Gothic Missal,¹⁸ the Gallican Missal,¹⁹ and the Bobbio Missal, which was used by Irish missionaries in Gaul.

We have no information whatever regarding the introduction of the Feast of the Assumption into Rome. We know that the oldest feast of Our Lady celebrated there was on January 1, the Octave of Our Saviour’s birth. It was first kept at Santa Maria Maggiore, and later at Santa Maria ad Martyres. All other feasts of Our Lady were probably of Byzantine origin. Under Sergius I (687-701), the Feast of the Assumption was, with the Feasts of the Nativity and the Annunciation, one of the chief Roman solemnities.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, 713.

¹⁶ P. L. lxxx, col. 446.

¹⁷ *Inscriptions Crét. de la Gaule*, vol. i, p. 181.

¹⁸ No. 317 in Queen Christina’s Collection at the Vatican Library.

¹⁹ No. 493 in the Palatine Collection at the Vatican.

The *Liber Pontificalis* speaks of it,²⁰ without implying in any way that it was of recent institution, so that some scholars have inferred that it went back to the days of Pope Gregory the Great (590-604). Duchesne denies this emphatically, saying: "It is certain that the Feasts of the Nativity and the Dormitio of the Blessed Virgin were not in existence in the time of St. Gregory. Not only does he never make mention of them, but the same is true of all the documents bearing on the Roman usage prior to, or considered prior to, the sixth century, such as the Calendar of Carthage, the Leonian Sacramentary, etc. But what is still more conclusive, these festivals were still unknown to the Anglo-Saxon Church at the beginning of the eighth century."²¹

About 847, Leo IV ordered the Feast of the Assumption to be celebrated with a vigil and octave in the basilica of St. Lawrence without the walls. We do not hear of it again for a century. In 858, Pope Nicholas I, in his response to the Bulgarians, mentions the fast on the vigil of the Assumption as "an ancient custom."

Duchesne believes that this feast is a Byzantine importation, which came from Rome to Gaul with the Roman liturgy. Kellner questions this, saying: "In the Gothic-Gallican Missal of the seventh or eighth century, edited by Mabillon, the festival is placed on January 18 and not on August 15, as is also the case

²⁰ Edit. Duchesne, vol. i, p. 376.

²¹ Duchesne, *Christian Worship*, p. 272.

in the Lectionary of Luxeuil of the seventh century. This circumstance points to the conclusion that, independently of Byzantine influence, it was observed already at an earlier date in other parts of the Church as well, and came into existence spontaneously, so to speak.”²²

There is a great deal of uncertainty about the date on which the Feast of the Assumption was celebrated. The primitive date in the West seems to have been January 18, for that is the day mentioned in Gregory of Tours, the Lectionary of Luxeuil, the Bobbio Missal, and in many of the ancient calendars and martyrologies. Baumer says that the monks in Egypt and Arabia kept this date, and that the monks of Gaul adopted it with many other usages of Egypt. In the Greek Church, some observed the feast in January with the monks of Egypt, and some in August with the monks of Palestine. The Emperor Maurice most likely made the observance uniform in the seventh century. One martyrology of the West²³ speaks of January 22, and the Coptic Church placed the feast on January 16 (21 Tybi).

In the eighth and ninth centuries, we find the feast mentioned by the Council of Salsburg in 799, by the Council of Mayence in 813, in the rule of St. Chrodegang, Bishop of Mayence, and in the laws of Herard, Archbishop of Tours. In the East, we have three homilies each of St. Andrew, Archbishop of Crete

²² *Heortology*, p. 238.

²³ *Martyr. Luccense of Fiorentini*.

(+ 720), St. Germanus, Patriarch of Constantinople (+ 733), and of St. John Damascene (+ 760). It is also mentioned by Cosmas, Bishop of Majuma in Palestine (+ 781), St. Theodore Studites (+ 826), and St. Joseph the Hymnographer (+ 833). From this time the witnesses become more numerous.

It is true that at the end of the eighth and during part of the ninth century, there were some writers who either questioned the fact of the Assumption, or declared, in view of the apocryphal accounts of it, that "piety and honesty both demanded a confession of ignorance" on the part of the Catholic scholar. For example, a pseudo-letter of St. Jerome to Paula and Eustochium of the eighth century, written probably by Abbot Autbert of St. Vincent, warns the faithful against the apocryphal *De Transitu Virginis*, and urges them "not to take its doubtful assertions for certain truth." The writer then adds: "Many of us doubt whether she was assumed together with her body, or whether she departed this life, having separated from her body. How, when or by whom her most sacred body was taken away, where it was conveyed, or whether she rose again, we do not know."²⁴

The supposed authority of St. Jerome misled a number of mediæval theologians, who professed utter ignorance of the fact of the Assumption. Among them we may mention the martyrologies of Ado and Usuard (858 and 860), the Capitularies of Charle-

²⁴ P. L. xxx, col. 122.

magne, the writings of the pseudo-Augustine and Idelphonsus. But, as the Abbé Renaudin asserts, "these are only rare discordant voices in the general concert of homage rendered to the Assumption of the Blessed Virgin by the Popes, the liturgies of the East and West, the teaching of the Fathers, the preaching of the Bishops, and the firm conviction of the faithful everywhere."

Since the ninth century, the doctrine has rarely been questioned. In August, 1497, the Dominican, Jean Morelle, while preaching in St. Benedict's Church of Paris, made a number of statements contrary to the accepted teaching on the Assumption. He was forced at once by the Sorbonne to retract. At the Cathedral of Paris, Usuard's martyrology, which ignored the Assumption, was read until 1540, when a homily explicitly setting forth the doctrine was substituted. A century later (1668), Canon Claude Joly managed to have the old martyrology restored, and at once a bitter controversy arose, in which the orthodox doctrine was ably defended against him by two other doctors of the University, Jacques Gaudin and Nicolas Billiard. Some of the Jansenists denied the Assumption, for in one of their books on the Rosary we read: "We must keep silence about the Assumption, and not honor the Blessed Virgin by rashness and lying."²⁵ The French historian Tillemont said that he was opposed to the doctrine of the Assumption "according to the principles of his-

²⁵ *La Solide Dévotion du Rosaire.*

tory, and not according to the principles of theology," a false distinction condemned in the modernism of the twentieth century. Noel Alexander also questioned this doctrine, but when called to account for it by his superiors, he asserted that he had simply meant to teach "that the Assumption was not a dogma defined by the Church."²⁶

The last controversy on the doctrine dates from the end of the eighteenth century. Dr. Marant, a professor of history at Louvain, denied, in the name of historical criticism, the fact of the Assumption, and when accused of rashness by some of the other professors, wrote a work against it, which was refuted by the Abbés Salmon, Van den Bavière, and Van den Driesch (1787, 1788). All these controversies in the long run were beneficial, as they resulted in theologians carefully distinguishing the solid from the faulty arguments frequently brought forward by over-zealous but not over-learned disputants. For example, it is generally admitted to-day that the two texts often cited in the past to prove the Assumption—Luke i. 28, and Genesis iii. 15—are by no means rigorous proofs, although once the doctrine is otherwise proved, they might give some intimation of the true teaching. The Abbé Renaudin devotes some thirty pages to the Scriptural proofs of the doctrine, but we were not impressed with this part of his work. It is true he sets forth accurately the typical sense of the Sacred Scriptures, and its use and interpretation by

²⁶ *Hist. Eccles.* II, ch. ii, art. 3, sec. 1.

Our Lord,²⁷ St. Paul,²⁸ and the other Apostles.²⁹ But he fails to grasp that the use of such types as the Ark of Noah, the Ark of the Covenant, the Burning Bush, the Spouse of the Canticle of Canticles, etc., with reference to the Assumption of Our Lady is merely oratorical coloring, and in no sense dogmatic proof.

In a most important chapter, entitled "The Divine Apostolic Tradition," the Abbé Renaudin shows conclusively that the Assumption is a doctrine that could only have originated by a special revelation of Our Lord to the Apostles. "How did they know this doctrine?" he asks, and then he suggests five different hypotheses:

1. They inferred the Assumption from the fact that they did not find the Blessed Virgin's body in the tomb (St. John Damascene);
2. They saw her body miraculously carried up to heaven by the ministry of angels;
3. They saw her going up to heaven as once they had seen the Lord;
4. They perceived her body in heaven, as St. Stephen once saw the heavens opened; or,
5. God revealed this prerogative of His Mother by a special revelation.

He concludes in favor of the last hypothesis, declaring that only on this supposition can we account for the wide and general acceptance of this doctrine

²⁷ Matt. xvii. 12; xxi. 42; Mark xii. 10; Luke xx. 17; John iii. 14; xiii. 18. and xv. 25.

²⁸ 1 Cor. xv. 45; Rom. v. 14; Gal. iv. 22; Col. ii. 16.

²⁹ 1 Peter iii. 20, 21; John xix. 36.

by the faithful, and its clear presentation to us to-day by the Church's ordinary magisterium.

He tells us in detail of the various *supplica* that have been forwarded to Rome in late years in favor of the definition of the doctrine of the Assumption as a dogma of faith, though he is very careful to state that at present "the doctrine is only certain, and not to be denied without the greatest rashness." The ordinary magisterium has not as yet given any pronouncement regarding its origin, and has not as yet presented it to the faithful as a part of the deposit of the faith. He hopes with many a devout soul that some day it will be promulgated by the Church as a dogma of the faith, as in 1854 the Immaculate Conception was by Pope Pius IX.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Batiffol—*The Roman Breviary*.
 Baumer—*Histoire du Bréviaire*.
 Benedict XIV—*De Festis B. V. M.*
 Bishop—*The Book of Cerne*.
 Cagin—*Paléographie Musicale*.
 Du Cange—*Glossarium infimæ Latinitatis*.
 Le Camus—*Les Sept Églises de l'Apocalypse*.
Dictionnaire d'Arch. Chrét. et de Liturgie, vol. i.
Dictionnaire de la Bible, vol. i.
Dictionnaire de Théologie Catholique, vol. i.
 Duchesne—*Christian Worship*.
 Forbes—*The Ancient Liturgies of the Gallican Church*.
 Gabrielovich—*Le Tombeau de la S. V. à Ephese*.
 Hurter—*Nomenclator Literarius*.
 Holwerk—*Fasti Mariani*.
 Hergenrother—*Hist. de l'Église*, vol. i, pp. 230-232.
 Kellner—*Heortologia*.

Mabillon—*Museum Italicum*.
Martigny—*Dict. des Antiquités Chrét.*
Nirschl—*Das Grab. der heil Jungfrau Maria*.
Probst—*Die Abendländische Messe*.
Renaudin—*De La Définition Dogmatique de l'Assomption*.
Terrien—*La Mère de Dieu*.
Thomassin—*Traité des Fêtes de l'Église*.
Tillemont—*Mémoires*.
Monsignor Timoni—*Panaghai-Capouli, ou Maison de la S. V.*
Tischendorf—*Apocalypses Apocryphæ*.

THE EDICT OF POPE CALLISTUS¹

IN the opening chapter of Tertullian's book *On Modesty* (*De Pudicitia*), we read: "I hear that there has been an Edict set forth, and a peremptory one, too. The *Pontifex Maximus*—that is, the Bishop of bishops—issues an Edict: I remit the sins both of adultery and fornication to such as have fulfilled (the requirements of) penance."

Ever since the seventeenth century scholars have argued about the meaning of this Edict. It was once ascribed to Pope Zephyrinus,² but since the discovery of the *Philosophumena* of Hippolytus in 1851,³ all agree in attributing it to Pope Callistus (A. D. 220). Some maintain that this decree evidenced a profound revolution in the Church's penitential discipline, which had hitherto excommunicated in perpetuity all baptized Christians guilty of the three capital sins of murder, apostasy, and impurity.⁴

Others hold that the Edict merely sanctioned the traditional discipline which was rejected by the Mon-

¹ *L'Édit de Calliste; Étude sur les Origines de la Pénitence Chrétienne.* By Adhemar d'Alès. Paris: Gabriel Beauchesne.

² Petavius, *De Pénitentia publica*, lib. 2, ch. ii, p. 244. (A. D. 1644.)

³ "He (Callistus) was the first to forgive men sins of impurity, by declaring that he forgave all sins." Philos. ix, 12.

⁴ Petavius, Funk, Boudinhon, Batiffol, Tixeront, Pohle, Vacandard, and Rauschen.

tanists of the third century, and that it attained undue prominence on account of the bitter attacks of Tertullian and Hippolytus.⁵

The Abbé d'Alès, in the present treatise, is a firm believer in the second theory, which he has defended before in the pages of the *Revue du Clergé Français*,⁶ and in his two works on *The Theology of Tertullian* and *The Theology of Hippolytus*.⁷ While admitting that the controversy has a dogmatic side, inasmuch as it concerns the historical exercise of the power of the keys, he declares it to be primarily an historical question, to be decided only after a careful consideration of the texts of the first three centuries. Granting that the Church possessed the power of pardon, did she, or did she not, for weighty reasons, refrain from exercising this power in regard to capital crimes? Such a problem cannot be solved *a priori*, as some unreasonable opponents of the historical method maintain. As Dr. Pohle well says: "We strongly insist upon the dogmatic theologian bowing before the facts of history, even though they appear extraordinary, and seeking to acquire a better understanding of the spirit of the primitive Church. Nothing can be more unfair than to judge the past by the present. Antiquity must be viewed in its historical setting and judged in its own light."⁸

⁵ Morinus, Monceaux, Seeburg, Esser, and Stufler.

⁶ Vol. i, pp. 337-365.

⁷ *La Théologie de Tertullien; La Théologie de Saint Hippolyte.*

⁸ *Lehrbuch der Dogmatik*, vol. iii, p. 404.

In Chapter II the Abbé d'Alès proves that our Saviour gave the pardoning power—the power to bind and loose—to St. Peter, when He appointed him head of the apostolic body;⁹ that the power granted to John¹⁰ and to the other Apostles¹¹ was merely an extension of the power granted to St. Peter, the foundation rock on which the Church was to be built.¹² The authenticity of these texts is maintained against those rationalistic critics who arbitrarily place them even as late as the beginning of the third century.¹³

He next discusses those Scriptural texts which are said to deny the Church's power of pardoning all sins. In St. Matthew's Gospel, our Saviour said to the Jews who refused to admit His miraculous power: "He that shall speak against the Holy Ghost, it shall not be forgiven him, neither in this world nor in the world to come."¹⁴ A careful study of the context will make it clear that there was no question of any limitation being put upon the pardoning power of the Church. The unpardonable sin was the Pharisees' obstinate denial of all divine power: that hatred of God which closed the eyes to the light, and rendered the soul incapable of pardon. "The sin of the Pharisees was more of an attitude of mind than a particular action; they persistently despised Him, Who was the Way, the Truth, and the Life."

⁹ Matt. xvi. 19.

¹¹ Matt. xviii. 18.

¹⁰ John xx. 23.

¹² Matt. xvi. 18.

¹³ Resch, *Aussercanonische Paralleltexte*, vol. ii, pp. 187-196.

¹⁴ Matt. xii. 32.

The passages from the Epistle to the Hebrews,¹⁵ which are frequently quoted to prove the existence of unpardonable sins, do not, as Harnack¹⁶ maintains, picture the primitive Church as "a society of saints, entirely opposed to the principle of penance, at least for grave sins, and consequently closed to repentant Christians." On the contrary, the author of this letter was writing to converts who were inclined to make little of their baptism, and who needed strengthening against all thought of relapsing into Judaism. The apostasy he denounced was "a persistent and obstinate apostasy."

When St. John speaks of "the sin unto death"¹⁷ and denies those guilty of it the benefit of Christian prayers, he has in mind only those who have been excommunicated for grave sins. The children of the devil,¹⁸ by their persistence in sin, render themselves incapable of pardon.

The New Testament clearly teaches that the Apostles considered their pardoning power unlimited. St. Peter does not despair of Simon Magus, but says to him: "Do penance, therefore, for this thy wickedness; and pray to God, that perhaps this thought of thy heart may be forgiven thee."¹⁹ St. Paul in his second letter to Corinth pardons the sinner whom he had excommunicated in the first.²⁰ St. James,²¹ St.

¹⁵ Heb. vi. 4-8; x. 26, 27; xii. 16, 17.

¹⁶ *Lehrbuch der Dogmengeschichte*, vol. i, p. 439.

¹⁷ 1 John v. 16.

²⁰ 2 Cor. ii. 10.

¹⁸ John viii. 44.

²¹ James iv. 8-9; v, 15-16.

¹⁹ Acts viii. 22.

Jude,²² and St. John,²³ are continually calling upon sinners to repent, and renew their first fervor. They certainly knew nothing of a Church composed solely of saints.

The oldest witness for the Church's penitential discipline is Hermas, the writer of that obscure and mysterious book known as *The Shepherd*. Very little is known about the author. Origen makes him a companion of St. Paul,²⁴ although Hermas' picture of the Roman Church certainly does not portray the apostolic age. The Muratorian fragment, with greater probability, declares him a brother of Pope Pius I (A. D. 139-154). But it is universally admitted that the book was written during the first half of the second century, although probably many years elapsed between the writing of its several parts. It was first placed among the canonical Scriptures; later on it was given a lower rank, though still read publicly in the churches. It is certainly an invaluable witness to the Church's penitential discipline.

There has always been, and there always will be, a great deal of controversy concerning Hermas' actual teaching on penance. Some scholars like Funk²⁵ and Rauschen²⁶ think him opposed to all ecclesiastical reconciliation after baptism; others like Stahl²⁷ con-

²² Jude xxii. 23.

²³ Apoc. ii. iii.

²⁴ *Comm. in Rom.*, x. 31; P. G. xiv. col. 1282.

²⁵ *Kirchengeschichtliche Abhandlungen*, vol. i, p. 171 *et seq.*

²⁶ *Eucharist and Penance*, pp. 155-159.

²⁷ *Patristische Untersuchungen*, vol. i, pp. 295, 296.

sider *The Shepherd* a manifesto of the anti-Montanistic party. Our author declares both these hypotheses untenable, the first because it contradicts the very text, and the second because it is founded upon an anachronism. Montanism was non-existent in Hermas' time.

His own theory, based on the text of the Third Vision, the Fourth Commandment, and the Eighth and Ninth Parables, is as follows: Hermas excludes no sincere penitent from the benefit of pardon. He repeats this time and time again.²⁸ He asserts, however, that some are so deeply rooted in sin that an extraordinary effort is required on their part to be freed therefrom. It is a fact that all sinners do not make this effort. Hermas strongly urges them to repent, and plainly sets forth the malice of those who refuse to do so. His encratism is not the encratism of Marcion,²⁹ but the fervent practice of the Christian law—a question of personal fervor, and not of ecclesiastical discipline.³⁰ If he speaks of apostates being without hope,³¹ it is only because they persist in their apostasy and blasphemy. Our author writes: "After as before baptism, the only certain sign of damnation is absolute obstinacy in sin.³² This is the doctrine of the Gospel—a distinct echo of the anath-

²⁸ Vis. iii, 3, 3-7. Com. iv, 3, 7. Sim. viii, 6, 6; ix, 7, 2; 33, 3.

²⁹ Tertullian, *Adv. Marc.*, i, 29; iv, 34. *La Théologie de Tertullien*, p. 460 *et seq.*

³⁰ Page 99.

³¹ Sim. ix, 26.

³² Vis. iii, 7, 2.

ema pronounced by Christ upon the sin against the Holy Ghost."

The Abbé d'Alès asserts against Funk that the idea of the Church being the dispenser of the pardoning power is clearly set forth in the pages of *The Shepherd*, although nowhere does it take the explicit form of a sacerdotal judgment. *The Shepherd*, although not an official document, is of the highest importance, because it reveals the mind of the Roman clergy of the second century.

"The Church in her universal call to salvation, had ever in mind the various classes of people who made up her fold. She judged it inopportune to tell the catechumens in advance all their chances of rehabilitation, if they sinned after baptism. To baptized Christians who relapsed after baptism into sins like adultery, apostasy, or idolatry, she offered once, by means of penance, not only the divine pardon, but pardon through the ministry of the Church. At the same time she took good care not to tell them that this penance could be renewed. She never despaired of the relapsed sinner, but always taught that whoever desired to do penance could regain thereby the grace of God."²³

The *Didache*²⁴ urges the Christian to confess his sins in Church, and not to dare enter the assembly with a bad conscience. It speaks of a confession of sins preliminary to the Eucharistic sacrifice, and rec-

²³ Page 113.

²⁴ 4, 14; 14, 1; 15, 3.

ommends fraternal correction to bring about the repentance of sinners.

St. Clement of Rome,⁸⁵ speaking of the sins of discord and insubordination at Corinth, adjures the guilty ones not to harden their hearts, but to repent of their iniquity. He declares that their amendment lies in submission to their priests, the doctors of penance; that humility is the way of salvation; that the center of Christian hope is the fold of Christ, His Church.⁸⁶

St. Ignatius of Antioch writes: “Where there is anger and division, God is not; but whoever does penance and returns to the unity of God around the bishop’s seat, is assured the grace of Jesus Christ to deliver him from every bond.”⁸⁷

St. Polycarp characterizes the ministry of the priests as a ministry of charity and mercy towards all. It requires, he tells us, “sweetness, impartiality, just judgment, disinterestedness, reserve in accepting accusations, and slowness in condemning. He prays God that he may give the apostate priest Valens and his wife the grace of true repentance.⁸⁸

We read in St. Irenæus⁸⁹ that the Gnostic Cerdon was admitted to penance about the year 140, and in Tertullian⁴⁰ that Marcion was received back more than once before his final excommunication. St.

⁸⁵ *Epis. ad Cor.*, viii, 5; 1, 5-51; lii, 1; lvii, 1, 2.

⁸⁶ Page 117.

⁸⁷ *Philadel.*, iii, 1, 2.

⁸⁸ *Philip.* vi, 1, 2; xi. 1-4.

⁸⁹ *Adv. Hær.*, iii, 4; P. G. vii, col. 857.

⁴⁰ *De Præs.*, 30.

Irenæus does indeed first assert that eternal flames will be the lot of every apostate, but a few lines further on he adds that "hell awaits all those who persevere in their apostasy without repentance."⁴¹ He does not broach the question of the remission of sins by an ecclesiastical ministry, but his silence is easily understood, once we remember how little space he gives in his writings to the doctrine of the sacraments. He makes but two allusions at most to the sacrament of baptism in his *Adversus Hæreses*.⁴² St. Justin Martyr declares that there is pardon in heaven for all repentant sinners. In explaining to the Jew Trypho that apostates will be lost forever unless they repent, he gives us to understand that if they do repent they will be saved.⁴³ Dionysius of Corinth⁴⁴ insists upon all truly repentant sinners—even apostates and heretics—being kindly received by the Church. In a word, the constant witness of the second century—Rome, Antioch, Corinth, and Alexandria—tells us that pardon is ever awaiting the repentant sinner.

The hierarchical Church, grouped about the bishop, is the normal dispenser of this pardon, and the offer of ecclesiastical reconciliation is an earnest of the offer of divine pardon. The only legislative measure of the second century that we meet with is the prohibition of repeating the public penance. The Church's aim in this strict discipline was to prevent laxity by

⁴¹ *Adv. Hær.*, v, 26, 2; P. G. vii, col. 1194.

⁴² iv, 36, 4; P. G. vii, col. 1093; c. 7.

⁴³ II *Apol.*, 2; P. G. vi, col. 444.

⁴⁴ Eusebius, *Hist. Eccles.* ivx, 23, 6.

giving this institution the form of an unique favor. Hermas is the first witness to this law, which is solely of ecclesiastical origin. There is no warrant for it, whatever, in the Sacred Scriptures. Introduced probably under the stress of peculiar circumstances, it gradually acquired the force of a general law.

The *De Pænitentia* of Tertullian, which he wrote while a Catholic, does not mention the existence of any unpardonable sins, nor does it speak of the pardon of sins independently of the ministry of the Church.⁴⁵ In this treatise, Tertullian defines penance,⁴⁶ and insists that it is necessary both for catechumens preparing for baptism,⁴⁷ and for Christians who have relapsed into sin after baptism.⁴⁸ He warns sinners that they can make use of this "second penance" only once,⁴⁹ and that their interior dispositions of sorrow must be manifested externally by the performance of the canonical penance or *exomologesis*, "the discipline for man's prostration and humiliation."⁵⁰ The Church is the dispenser of the second penance, just as she is of the first penance or baptism. This our author deduces from Tertullian's own words: "Therefore, while it (the canonical penance) abases a man, it raises him; while it covers him with squalor, it renders him more clean; while it accuses, it excuses; while it condemns, it absolves."⁵¹

⁴⁵ Pages 151-168.

⁴⁹ Ch. v.

⁴⁶ Ch. i.

⁵⁰ Ch. ix.

⁴⁷ Chs. iv-vi.

⁵¹ Ch. ix.

⁴⁸ Chs. vii-xii.

In the *De Pudicitia*, Tertullian, now a Montanist,⁵² attacks the Catholic teaching of his *De Pænitentia*. Angry at the Pope's Edict,⁵³ which set forth so clearly the Church's claim to pardon all sinners, the puritan Tertullian formulates his teaching about the unpardonable sins,⁵⁴ not as an appeal to the original tradition of the Church, as some Catholic scholars maintain, but as a protest of "the spotless young Church of the paraclete" against the old and corrupt Church of Callistus. He then proceeds to ridicule bitterly the Church's claim to pardon all sins, for his heretical sect maintained, "the Lord alone has power to pardon."⁵⁵ Tertullian, like all heretics, denied the divine authority of the Church, and consequently her power to pardon. Montanism was essentially a multitude without any organic authority, its members depending entirely on a supposed direct illumination of the Spirit.

Not very long after the schism of Tertullian in Carthage, the schism of Hippolytus occurred at Rome. Hippolytus' philippic against Pope Callistus, the *Philosophumena*, aims at giving a complete history of all heresies, and paints in the blackest colors possible, "the sect of Callistus," *i. e.*, the Catholic Church. His viewpoint is different from Tertullian's, inasmuch as he proposes to give a picture of the whole career of a detested rival, while Tertullian writes apropos of a particular act of the Pope.

⁵² Ch. ii.

⁵³ Ch. i.

⁵⁴ Ch. ii.

⁵⁵ Ch. iii.

Hippolytus tells us that Pope Callistus grants pardon to sinners of every description, especially to those followers of his who, repenting of their schism, are anxious to return to Catholic unity. The Pope refuses to depose every bishop guilty of a capital crime, and admits into the ranks of the clergy men who had been married two or three times. He gains the applause of the multitude by flattering their passions contrary to the law of Christ, and encourages them to commit sin by boasting of his power to pardon the well-disposed. He permits noble women to marry secretly beneath their rank—even slaves—against the civil law, and thereby is an abettor of concubinage and abortion; yet despite all this he continues without the slightest shame to call his party the Catholic Church. For the first time in history we find him and his followers asserting a second baptism, etc.⁵⁶

We can easily read through the lines of this bitter diatribe. The schismatic Hippolytus is angry at the defections in his ranks, and, in the bitterness of his railing, witnesses despite himself to the universal mercy and pardon which the Catholic Church at all times accords the repentant sinner. It is most likely that for good reasons Pope Callistus pardoned certain unfaithful clerics, but there is no evidence whatever to show that he abrogated the canon law deposing unworthy priests and bishops, which we know was in existence long after his pontificate. That he ignored the marriage laws of the pagan Emperors Marcus

⁵⁶ Philos. ix, 2.

Aurelius and Commodus,⁵⁷ is greatly to his credit, and proves both his good sense and kindly Christian heart. We can readily believe that some of these marriages turned out badly, and that some of the women alluded to were actually guilty of child murder; but the law-giver who legislates honestly for the general good is never considered responsible for the crimes of every law-breaker.

The Abbé d'Alès admits, with De Rossi⁵⁸ that under Pope Callistus there was a certain softening of the old-time rigorous discipline in particular cases, and that the anger of Hippolytus was due to the Pope's clear and uncompromising defense of the Church's claim to pardon all sinners, no matter what their crimes. The second baptism that Hippolytus speaks of was probably the "second penance" of Tertullian, and not re-baptism, for we learn from one of the immediate successors of Pope Callistus, Pope Stephen (A. D. 254-257), that re-baptism was always discountenanced by the Roman Church.

We see, therefore, that Tertullian protested against the Edict of Callistus, because the Pope maintained—or at least strongly enforced—the old-time discipline mentioned by Hermas,⁵⁹ whereas Hippolytus protested against an innovation introduced by the Pope Callistus to flatter men's passions. Against Funk, the Abbé d'Alès holds that Tertullian was right. The Edict of Callistus was in no sense an innovation; it

⁵⁷ *Dig.*, I, ix, 8; XXIII, i, 16; 16, 42, 44, 47; XXIV, 1, 3.

⁵⁸ *Bullettino*, 1866, p. 30.

⁵⁹ *De Pud.*, 10, 12.

simply evidenced the enforcement of an old Church law which some Catholic bishops were in danger of forgetting, and which was denied by the heretics and schismatics of the time.

Origen was too extraordinary a teacher—he may be rightly styled the Doctor of Penance—to escape being claimed by both parties in the present controversy. Both sides admit that he declared in his book against Celsus (A. D. 246–248) the possible pardon and reconciliation of all sinners, no matter how grossly they might have offended.⁶⁰ But some maintain that he changed his opinion in the fourteen years that elapsed from the time he had written his *De Oratione* (A. D. 232–235).⁶¹

Origen tells us that “we must not despair of those who weep for their sins and turn again to God, for the malice of our sinning does not surpass the goodness of God.”⁶² He declares further that those who speak of “natures incapable of salvation” are heretics.⁶³ He makes it pretty clear in some of his homilies that it is the Church which effects the reconciliation of sinners by means of her system of public penance. “What we do in secret,” he writes, “even by mere words or thoughts, must be published and declared by him who makes himself the accuser of the sin after having been the instigator.”⁶⁴ Homicide and adultery

⁶⁰ *Contra Celsum.*, iii, 51; P. G. xl, col. 988.

⁶¹ xxviii, 10; P. G. xi, 529.

⁶² In *Lev.* (xvi), Hom. ix, 8; P. G. xii, col. 520.

⁶³ In *Jer.* (li), Hom. xxi, 12; P. G. xiii, col. 541.

⁶⁴ In *Lev.* (v.), Hom. iii, 4; P. G. xii, col. 429.

are not unpardonable sins,⁶⁵ for the Church can reconcile all sinners without exception.” In the present life, “anyone who has left the assembly of the people of God can return to it by penance.”⁶⁶ Only those who sin against the Holy Ghost cannot be pardoned; not that the Holy Ghost is in any way superior to Christ, but because such sinners turn away from the counsels of the Spirit, Who dwells within them, and obstinately persevere in their sin. Every mortal sin of a baptized Christian is a sin against the Holy Ghost which merits eternal damnation, unless he repents of it with all his heart.⁶⁷ To be pardoned his sin, the sinner must have recourse to those who have on earth the power of the keys, *i. e.*, St. Peter and the bishops who share with him his dignity.⁶⁸ When Origen speaks of unpardonable sins in his *De Oratione*, he does not imply that they are unpardonable *in se*, but unpardonable on account of the malice of unrepentant sinners or the laxity of priests who fail to dispose them to penance.⁶⁹ He makes a clear-cut distinction between slight faults which are easily pardoned by the divine goodness, and those graver faults which require public penance. He looks upon every tendency to relax the severity of the ordinary penitential discipline as a menace to Christian morality, but he never

⁶⁵ In Ex. (xv.), Hom. vi, 9; P. G. xii, col. 335.

⁶⁶ In Zech. (xiv. 8), Hom. iii, 8; P. G. xiii, col. 694.

⁶⁷ In Joan. (i. 3), i, ii, 11; P. G. xiv, col. 129. Cf. Poschmann, *Die Sündenvergebung bei Origenes*, p. 7.

⁶⁸ In Matt. (xviii. 18), Hom. xiii, 31; P. G. xiii, col. 1180.

⁶⁹ xxviii, 8-10; P. G. xi, col. 528.

once doubts the Church's power to pardon all sins.⁷⁰ Whether or not he denied the right of pardon to sinful bishops and priests is uncertain, although our author rejects this theory himself.⁷¹ The so-called conflict between Origen and Pope Callistus⁷² he considers absolutely imaginary, for, first, the only writings of Origen which may be dated with any probability during the pontificate of Pope Callistus, give no evidence whatever of any such conflict; second, the only treatise in which some claim to have found a trace of this pretended conflict, is not contemporaneous with Pope Callistus; and third, if this treatise is read together with the other writings of Origen, it takes on a totally different meaning. It is undoubtedly true that Origen very frequently anathematized the sin of impurity, and associated it with the other great sins of idolatry and murder. But he never manifested the slightest intention of protesting against any Papal act such as the Edict of Callistus. There is good reason to believe that he knew the *De Pudicitia* and the *Philosophumena*, but it never can be proved that he sympathized in any form with either the Roman schism or the African heresy.

The successors of Pope Callistus in the third century held the same views as he did upon the reconciliation of repentant sinners. We see this clearly in the question of the *lapsi* in North Africa, where so

⁷⁰ In *Lev.* (xxv), *Hom.* xv, 2, 3; *P. G.* xii, col. 560.

⁷¹ Holl, *Enthusiasmus und Bussegwalt*, p. 231.

⁷² Doellinger, *Hippolytus und Kallistus*, pp. 254-256.

many had denied the faith during the persecution of Decius. The Roman clergy wrote two letters to St. Cyprian, urging him not to admit them to communion until they had undergone penance,⁷³ but neither Rome nor Carthage questioned for a moment the right of idolaters to be pardoned by the Church.

The election of Pope Cornelius cemented an alliance between the Chair of Peter and the African Episcopate grouped about St. Cyprian. They agreed in retaining the old penitential discipline, *i. e.*, the immediate reconciliation of the *libellatichi* after an investigation of each particular case, and the admitting to penance of the *sacrificati*, and their reconciliation at the hour of death if they persevered. At Rome some clerics, like the priest Maximus and others, were fully restored after they had abandoned the schism of Novatian, while others, like the Novatian bishop, Tropimus, for certain reasons, were admitted only to lay communion. Later on a council of Carthage extended to the *sacrificati* the same privileges that had formally been granted to the *libellatichi*, provided they gave signs of true penance.

There is not a text of the first three centuries which can be adduced to prove that reconciliation was denied to murderers. On the contrary, we find testimony after testimony to the fact of their being pardoned in Hermas,⁷⁴ the Didascalia of the Apostles,⁷⁵ Clement

⁷³ *Epistolæ*, xxx, xxxvi.

⁷⁵ Ch. ix.

⁷⁴ *Vis.* ii, 2, 2.

of Alexandria,⁷⁶ Origen,⁷⁷ Eusebius,⁷⁸ and St. Gregory Thaumaturgus.⁷⁹

The reader can readily see that this scholarly dissertation of the Edict of Callistus will prove invaluable to the student of the origins of the Church's early penitential discipline. Many of his conclusions are disputed by Catholic scholars like Funk,⁸⁰ Batiffol,⁸¹ Vacandard,⁸² Duchesne,⁸³ Tixeront,⁸⁴ and Rauschen,⁸⁵ and the brevity and obscurity of the passages in dispute will perhaps leave many of these problems forever insoluble. Most men, in matters wherein the Church has not spoken, will take sides in interpreting those documents according as the bias of their minds is conservative or not. The Abbé d'Alès treats the arguments of his opponents with the utmost courtesy and fairness, although, we must admit, they have been utterly unmoved by his answers to their objections.⁸⁶

⁷⁶ *Quis dives salvetur*, 42.

⁷⁷ In Ex., Hom. v, 1, 9; P. G. xii, col. 338.

⁷⁸ *Hist. Eccles.*, vi, 34; *Chronicon Pascale*, P. G. xcii, col. 668; case of Emperor Philip (A. D. 244-249).

⁷⁹ *Epist. Can.*, viii, P. G. x, col. 1040.

⁸⁰ *Kirchenges. Abhand.*, 3 vols. Paderborn, 1897, 1899, 1907.

⁸¹ *Bulletin de litt. Eccles.*, p. 339. Paris, 1906.

⁸² *Revue du Clergé Français*, pp. 113-131. Paris, April, 1907.

⁸³ *Histoire Ancienne de l'Église*, vol. i, p. 317. Paris, 1908.

⁸⁴ *Histoire des dogmes*, vol. i, p. 368. Paris, 1906.

⁸⁵ *Eucharist and Penance*, pp. 152-184. Bonn, 1908.

⁸⁶ *Revue du Clergé Français*, pp. 365-367. May 15, 1907.

THE LEGEND OF POPE JOAN

ONE of the most common historical questions deposited in the Question Box during our missions to non-Catholics is the following: "Was there not in the Middle Ages a female Pope?" Time and time again has this fable been refuted, but, like all fables calculated to discredit the Holy See, it is still part of the stock-in-trade of the unscholarly and unscrupulous anti-Catholic lecturer and writer. We propose in the present essay to give a brief account of the origin, development, and falsity of this legend of Pope Joan.

It is now generally admitted by critical historians that the earliest authentic document referring to Pope Joan dates from the thirteenth century. The earlier texts such as the *Liber Pontificalis* (ninth century), Marianus Scotus (+ 1086), Sigeburt of Gembloux (+ 1112), Otto of Friesingen (+ 1158), Richard of Poitiers (circ. 1174), Godfrey of Viterbo (+ 1191), and Gervaise of Tillbury (circ. 1211) have all been proved interpolations of later centuries. The first four authentic references are John de Mailley's *Chronicle of Metz* (circ. 1250), the *De Diversis Matteriis* of Stephen de Bourbon (circ. 1261), the *Chronica Minor* of a Franciscan of Erfurt (1261), and the *Chronicle of the Roman Pontiffs* of Martin of Troppau (Polonus, 1279).

These eleven texts may be divided into two groups, the first dependent on the chronicle of Metz, and the second on the chronicle of Martin of Troppau. Each group gives a different version of the legend.

Group I. The chronicle of Metz puts the story tentatively as follows: "Query. With regard to a certain Pope, or Popess, because she was a woman who pretended to be a man. On account of his ability, he became in turn notary of the Curia, Cardinal, and Pope. One day while he was riding, he gave birth to a child. According to the Roman law, his feet were tied together, and he was dragged at a horse's tail for half a league, while the people stoned him. He was buried on the spot where he died, and this inscription set up:

*Petre, Pater Patrum, Papisse Prodito Partum.*¹

During his pontificate, the fast of the Ember Days, called the Popess' fast, was instituted."² This account is recorded after the Pontificate of Victor III, who died in 1087.

Stephen of Bourbon adds but two details, viz., that she came to Rome from some other city, and that she became Cardinal and Pope by the devil's aid. His inscription puts *Parce* in place of *Petre*, and *Prodere* in place of *Prodito*. He dates the event 1100 A. D. The Franciscan of Erfurt briefly recites the same

¹ "Peter, Father of Fathers, reveal the childbirth of the Popess."

² *Monumenta Germaniae Historica Scriptores*, vol. xxiv, p. 514.

story, adding that the Popess was a beautiful woman, and that the devil himself revealed the fact that she was with child. He places the event in 915 A. D.

Group II. The popular mediæval chronicle of Martin of Troppau (Polonus) is the origin of all the interpolated accounts of the female Pope in the *Liber Pontificalis*, Marianus Scotus, Sigeburt of Gambloux, Otto of Friesingen, Godfrey of Viterbo, and Gervaise of Tillbury.

According to Martin, Pope Joan succeeded Leo IV, who died in 855. His account runs as follows:

“After the aforesaid Leo, John, an Englishman by descent, who came from Mainz, held the see two years, five months and four days, and the pontificate was vacant one month. He died at Rome. He, *it is asserted*, was a woman . . . while Pope she became pregnant. But not knowing the time of her delivery, while going from St. Peter’s to the Lateran, being taken in labor, she brought forth a child between the Coliseum and St. Clement’s Church. And afterwards, dying, she was, *it is said*, buried in that place. And because the Lord Pope always turns aside from that way, there are some who are fully persuaded that it is done in detestation of the fact . . .”³

The interpolator of the *Liber Pontificalis* gives her reign as two years, one month, and four days, while the author of the account in Marianus Scotus agrees with Martin of Troppau. The chronicle of Otto of

³ Dr. S. R. Maitland’s translation in the *British Magazine*, vol. xxii, p. 42.

Friesingen makes Pope John VII the female Pope, thus assigning the date A. D. 705. Perhaps he realized the impossibility of putting in Pope Joan between Leo IV and Benedict III.

How did the legend originate? At least ten different theories have been put forward since the seventeenth century to account for this legend, but the majority of them are most arbitrary and improbable. Leo Allatius⁴ believed that the people made a Pope out of a pseudo-prophetess, Thiota, condemned by the Synod of Mainz in 847; Leibnitz⁵ held that a woman had been bishop once of some see outside of Rome; Blasco⁶ considered the legend an allegorical satire on the False Decretals; Suares, Bishop of Vaison, traced the legend to the wife of the anti-Pope, Pierre de Corbière (1328); Baronius⁷ thought the weakness of John VIII in dealing with Photius led the people to call him in mockery the woman Pope, and that the legend arose from a later chronicler taking the term literally; Wouters⁸ held a similar theory with regard to John VII and his dealings with the Council in Trullo (692); Secchi considered the legend a mere fabrication of the Greeks at the time of the Photian schism. All these hypotheses are ruled out of court by modern scholars, who propose three probable explanations.

⁴ *Confutatio fabulæ de Joanna papissa*, Rome, 1630.

⁵ *Flores sparsi in tumulum papissæ*, Göttingen, 1758.

⁶ *Diatribæ de Joanna papissa*, Naples, 1778.

⁷ *Annales eccles.*, ad an. 853.

⁸ *Dissertationes*, Louvain, 1870.

1. Bellarmine, in his treatise on the Pope,⁹ mentions the letter of Pope Leo IX to Michael Cerularius, Patriarch of Constantinople, which protested against the consecration of eunuchs to the episcopate, and alluded to a rumor which had reached him that a woman had once been Patriarch.¹⁰ This letter proves conclusively that in 1054 the legend of the female Pope had not as yet arisen, otherwise the Greeks could easily have retorted by a *tu quoque*. The Abbé Lapôtre¹¹ and E. Bernheim¹² both call attention to the tenth century *Chronicon Salernitanum*,¹³ which relates this story of the woman patriarch of Constantinople, and both see in it the germ of the legend of Pope Joan.

2. In the tenth century Rome was practically ruled by Theodora, wife of Theophylact, and her two daughters, Marozia and Theodora. The four Popes named John, John X (+ 929), John XI (+ 936), John XII (+ 964), John XIII (+ 972), who reigned at this time, were so dominated by them that it is easy to imagine the people saying: "We have women for Popes." The Abbé Lapôtre quotes a chronicle of Benedict of St. Andrew, used by Martin of Troppau, which says that under John XI, Rome "fell into the power of a woman (Marozia), and was governed by

⁹ *De Romano Pontifice*, Book III, chap. xxiv.

¹⁰ P. L. CXLIII, col. 780.

¹¹ *Le Pape Jean VIII*, p. 365.

¹² *Zur sage der Päpstin Johanna* in the *Deutsche Zeit, für Geschicht*, vol. iii, p. 410.

¹³ M. G. H., SS., vol. iii, p. 481.

her.”¹⁴ Such a document, he adds, might easily account for the origin of the legend that a woman had really occupied the Holy See. He believes that his hypothesis is confirmed by the fact that the name Johanna is the feminine of John, and that Joan became Pope between a Leo and a Benedict. We know that Pope John XII was deposed by a Council held at St. Peter’s under the patronage of the Emperor Otho, and was replaced by Leo VIII. Once Otho departed from Rome, John XII returned, and in a Council at the Lateran he condemned Leo VIII and his adherents. At his death, May 14, 964, the Romans, passing over Leo VIII, chose Benedict V Pope.

3. It is certain that, as late as the fifteenth century, there was a statue of a pagan goddess with a child in a narrow Roman street near St. Clement’s Church on the way to the Lateran. This statue was removed to the Quirinal by Sixtus V,¹⁵ probably on account of the legends which centered about it. This statue bore an inscription consisting of five letters, P. P. P. P. P. Lelièvre, in the *Revue des Questions Historiques*,¹⁶ interprets it as follows:

Pater Patrum (a priest of Mithra)
Propria Pecunia Posuit (erected this monument at
his own expense).

The populace, having a vague notion of a female Pope, deduced either from the woman Patriarch of

¹⁴ *Chronicon*, ch. xxx, M. G. H., SS., vol. iii, p. 714.

¹⁵ *Florimond de Redmond, l'Anti-Papesse*, p. 182.

¹⁶ Vol. xx, p. 75.

Constantinople or the dominance of Marozia in the Rome of the tenth century, were not satisfied with this simple explanation, but interpreted these letters in the way we find recorded in the chronicle of Metz, viz.:

Petre, Pater Patrum, Papisse Proditio Partum.

When the Popes went in solemn procession from St. Peter's to the Lateran, they avoided passing along the street which leads from the Coliseum to St. Clement's. Some concluded that they did so out of very shame, because the statue of Pope Joan stood there, whereas the real reason was the extreme narrowness of the street.

It is interesting to note the variations of the legend in the course of history. While the main source of the two particular stories may be readily traced in every case, each writer seems to feel perfectly free to make additions and changes at will. In 1260, a Franciscan tells us in his *Flores Temporum*¹⁷ that the Popess was called John of England, although as a matter of fact she came from Mainz. We see at once the chronicler's evident desire to reconcile the two contradictory accounts of Joan's birth. In the main, he follows the text of Martin of Troppau, though he differs from him in a few details.

Boccaccio, in his *De Claris Mulieribus* (+ 1375), makes the Popess a German named Gilberta. She studied in England, and succeeded by the devil's power in becoming Pope.

¹⁷ M. G. H., SS., vol. xxiv, p. 243.

Another variation of the legend by an unknown author¹⁸ relates that Joan was deposed, became a religious, and lived until her son became Bishop of Ostia. She wanted to be buried in the street, the *Vicus Pappissæ*, where her child had been born, but this was refused, and she was buried at Ostia.¹⁹

Doellinger published a manuscript of the fourteenth century²⁰ which declared that the Popess was named Glancia, and came from Thessaly. She became Pope under the name of Jutta, and not John.

John Huss called the Popess Agnes, as we read in his fourteenth proposition: "The Church has been deceived in the person of (Popess) Agnes."²¹ No one objected to this thesis at the time, for the fable of Pope Joan was generally admitted.²²

The legend, in its various forms, was very commonly believed for the three hundred years preceding the Reformation. Lenfant²³ cites one hundred and fifty writers who mention it, and he does not enumerate them all. It was exploited by John Huss and William Occam, and by Gerson and his Gallican followers.

Martin of Troppau, the source from whom so many drew their versions of the legend, was the penitentiarius of five Popes. The Augustinian, Amaury d'Augier, chaplain of Urban V, made Joan the one

¹⁸ Manuscript in the Berlin Library.

¹⁹ Rev. H. Thurston, *The Month*, May, 1914, p. 454.

²⁰ *Die Papst-Fabeln des Mittelalters*, pp. 50, 51.

²¹ Hefele, *Conciliengeschichte*, vol. vii, p. 165.

²² Lenfant, *Histoire du Concile, de Constance*, vol. i, p. 324.

²³ *Histoire de la Papesse Jeanne*, part ii, ch. v.

hundred and tenth Pope,²⁴ and Platina, the librarian of the Holy See under Sixtus IV, put her after Leo IV as the one hundred and sixth Pope.²⁵ When the portraits of the Popes were placed in the Cathedral of Siena in 1400, the portrait of Pope Joan figured among them, despite the fact that Pius II, Pius III, and Marcellus II had been Archbishops of Siena. Her portrait was finally removed by the Grand Duke of Tuscany, at the instance of Clement VIII, who substituted Pope Zachary (+ 752).

John de Torquemada and Adrian of Utrecht, afterwards Pope Adrian VI, admitted the legend without question, and St. Antoninus of Florence, while doubting it himself, dared not come out openly against it. In fact, there is not a chronicle of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, published in Italy under the eyes of the Popes, which does not mention the existence of Pope Joan.

Since the Reformation, Protestant controversialists have often spoken of "the Popess Joan as the eternal shame of the Papacy." The Centuriators of Magdebourg record it three times.²⁶ We find it mentioned by a court preacher, Polycarp Leiser, Luke Osiander (1583), Samuel Huner (1596), Aretius of Berne (1574), Spanheim (1691), Lenfant (1736), etc. Lenfant's *Histoire de la Papesse Jeanne*, published at Cologne in 1694,²⁷ gives the legend in all its details.

²⁴ *Actus pontificum Romanorum*.

²⁵ *De Vitis Pontificum*, p. 119.

²⁶ *Centuria IX*, 333, 357, 501.

²⁷ The Hague in 1736.

Before the Reformation we find few Catholics questioning the fable of Pope Joan. The only ones that spoke in a hesitating manner were James de Maerlant (1300), the anonymous author of a life of Urban V, published by Baluze, *Æneas Piccolomini*, afterwards Pius II, St. Antoninus of Florence, and Plantina, in his *Lives of the Popes*.²⁸ They had so small a following that the Franciscan Rioche declared that their denials went counter to the general opinion of Christendom.

One of the first to deny it emphatically was John Thurmayer (Aventinus), in his *Annales Boiorum* (1544). He was not much of a Catholic, for Bayle calls him "a good Lutheran in disguise," and his book was put on the Index of 1564. In 1568, Onofrio Panvinio devoted three pages of his edition of Platina's *Lives of the Popes* to refute the legend, which, de Laval (1611) says, were sufficient to convince Protestants like Casaubon and de Thou. Bellarmine made use of the proofs of Panvinio in his *De Romano Pontifice*.²⁹ The most complete refutation of the fable came from the pen of Florimond de Remond, a member of the French Parliament from Bordeaux. His book, *The Anti-Christ and the Anti-Pope*, although declamatory and full of digressions, showed clearly the inherent contradictions of the legend and its utter improbability. Baronius inserted a summary of it in his *Annals*.

²⁸ Vol. i, p. 207.

²⁹ *De la Servière. La Théologie de Bellarmin*, pp. 110, 111.

Bayle in his *Dictionary*³⁰ tells us that in the seventeenth century a number of Protestants began to deny this legend. Among them were Chamier, Dumoulin, Bochart, and particularly David Blondel (+ 1655). Two pamphlets by the last-named writer caused quite a stir among Protestant polemists, some of whom, like Spanheim and Lefant, made a most strenuous effort to exploit the legend in the interests of Protestantism. The famous Leibnitz wrote against Spanheim, and Bayle in his *Dictionary* gave the story its quietus forever in the world of scholars. The eighteenth century rationalists took their cue from Bayle, as we may read in Voltaire.³¹ Among scholars to-day the legend is unanimously rejected.

The one argument conclusive against the fable of Pope Joan is the chronological argument. All the dates given for her pontificate are not only mutually contradictory, but are assigned to some other well-known Pope. The most commonly given date in the legend is 855, between Popes Leo IV and Benedict III. We know that Leo IV died July 17, 855, and that Benedict III was elected Pope a few days afterwards. On September 21, he was expelled from Rome by an anti-Pope, but returned soon after, took possession of his see, and was consecrated in the presence of the Emperor's legates on September 29. He was Pope until April, 858, as Garampi has shown in his dissertation, *On the Silver Coin of Benedict III*

³⁰ Vol. i, p. 576.

³¹ *Oeuvres*, Geneva, 1777, vol. xxx, p. 5.

(Rome, 1749). Pope Nicholas I was consecrated on April 24, 858, so that we have only ten weeks unaccounted for in the interval between Leo IV and Nicholas I.³² It is impossible to locate in this century the so-called pontificate of Pope Joan. The other dates assigned—915, 1087, and 1100—are likewise historically impossible.

³² Duchesne, *Liber Pontificalis*, vol. ii, preface, pp. lxvii.

THE ORIGINAL DIARIES OF THE COUNCIL OF TRENTO

VOLUME I

THE Goerres Society, which represents the best modern German scholarship, has well merited the praise of Popes Leo XIII and Pius X for undertaking to publish all the original documents relating to the Council of Trent.¹ This monumental work will be completed in thirteen splendid quartos of some thousand pages each, four of which (vols. i, ii, iv, and v) have already been published.

For nearly three centuries our knowledge of the inner workings of the Council of Trent has been obtained principally from either the prejudiced and unreliable *History of the Council of Trent* by the apostate Servite, Fra Paola Sarpi (London, 1619), or the polemical treatise² published to refute it by the Jesuit Cardinal, Sforza Pallavicino (Rome, 1656). Neither of these writers was capable of writing an objective, impartial history. For as Calenzio says: "Neither Pallavicino nor Sarpi possessed the true historical spirit, which is bent solely upon discovering

¹ *Concilium Tridentinum Diariorum, Actorum, Epistolarum, Tractatum Nova Collectio* (*The Council of Trent, a New Collection of its Diaries, Acts, Epistles, and Treatises*). Edidit Societas Goerresiana. St. Louis, Mo.: B. Herder. Vol. I,

² *Istoria del Concilio di Trento.*

the truth, and setting it forth in all clearness and honesty. Sarpi wrote to attack the Church, and Pallavicino to defend her at all costs."³ Bossuet wrote of Sarpi: "He was a Protestant under a religious habit, who said Mass without believing in it, and who remained in a Church which he considered idolatrous." Pallavicino, in a letter to the Marchese Durazzo, June 2, 1657, says of his own work: "My history is in great part apologetic in tone. In fact, it is more of a book of polemics than a history properly so-called. I aim at refuting my adversary, by showing his ignorance and deceit, and hope to win the confidence of my readers by proving to them that I am well informed. I would have them highly esteem both the rulers of the Church and those who presided over the Council," etc.⁴

Bishop Hefele, in his well-known *History of the Councils of the Church*, declared only forty years ago that he would not dare write the history of the Council of Trent, not only because of his age and the heavy burden of the episcopate, but because he could not obtain access to the original *Acta* of the Council written by Angelo Massarelli, its secretary-general.⁵

The very year (1874) in which Bishop Hefele made this statement, Father Theiner, the Prefect of the Vatican Archives, published his *Acta genuina Concilii Tridentini* (two volumes), but this edition did not

³ *Esame critico-litterario delle opere riguardanti la storia del concilio di Trento*, p. 117.

⁴ *Littere del Pallavicino*, p. 71. Venice, 1669.

⁵ *Conciliengeschichte*, vol. ii, præf., p. vii. Freiburg, 1874.

pretend to give all the critical documents, and even those that were given were not published in full. He paid no attention whatever to the editing of the other documents so essential to a clear understanding of the Council, such as the diaries of the secretary-general, the letters of the legates, the Cardinals of the Curia, the bishops and the foreign ambassadors.

Some may ask what is the use of publishing such an enormous amount of original material, when any scholar competent to write a history of the Council could read the manuscripts himself? As a matter of fact, no one man would be able to read all the original documents, which are scattered in hundreds of public and private libraries in Italy, Spain, Hungary, Germany, Austria, France, Belgium, and England. But even if one man could have mastered all this material—it would take him many years of continuous work—we would still be doubtful about his critical estimate of the various documents, which are frequently colored by writers who favor politically either Spain, France, or the Holy See.

Before the opening of the Vatican Archives to the world by Pope Leo XIII, it was impossible for any scholar, Catholic or non-Catholic, to obtain access to many of the most important original documents. Not only the Roman See, but all the governments of Europe for centuries guarded most jealously their State documents. We know that even Pallavicino, who was chosen by the General of his order to defend the Council against the attacks of Sarpi, was not al-

lowed to see the documents himself, but had to be content with excerpts expressly made by two of the custodians of the Vatican library, Conteloro and Centroflorino, and submit his work to the strictest possible censorship before publication. Oderico Raynaldi, continuing three centuries later the *Annals* of Baronius, suffered the same restrictions.

Ranke wrote in 1836 that a new history of the Council of Trent was absolutely necessary, but he was utterly skeptical about its ever being accomplished. He wrote in his *Roman Papacy*: "That those who could do it have no wish to see it done, and those anxious to do it do not possess the means."⁶ As a matter of fact, however, we know that it was the original intention of the Roman Pontiffs to publish everything relating to the Council. We learn this from two letters that Cardinal Cervino, afterwards Pope Marcellus II (1555), wrote to Massarelli, November 12 and December 1, 1548. He acknowledges the receipt of two volumes of the decrees, and urges his correspondent to arrange carefully the *Acta* of the Council in view of their being printed.⁷ Moreover the manuscripts of the *Acta* in the Vatican Archives are marked "imprimenda"—to be printed. That they were not printed *de facto* was due first to the sudden death of Massarelli, July 16, 1566,⁸ and second, to the well-founded conviction that the enemies of the Church would use them everywhere for the

⁶ *Die Römischen Päpste*, vol. iii, p. 289.

⁷ Pages 809, 813.

⁸ Page lxxix.

purpose of anti-Catholic polemics. There were no Protestant scholars in that day either competent or willing to write a true history of the Council of Trent, which they knew was held chiefly to condemn the errors of Protestantism. They would simply have used the *Acta* to frame new charges against the Church and its rulers.

Many non-Catholic writers, who blame the Pope severely for not having published all the documents on the Council in the Vatican Archives, in reality justify the Roman authorities by their conduct. For they prove by their writings that they do not care so much for the records in themselves, as for the acts or sayings of the prelates which can be used against the Church. They take special delight, for instance, in calling attention to the sermon preached before the Council by a layman, Count Nogarola, December 26, 1545;⁹ the dancing of the bishops at the citadel of Trent on March 3, 1546;¹⁰ the scandalous speech of Father Diruta, preacher of the Cardinal of Trent, May 1, 1546;¹¹ the unseemly quarrel between an Italian and a Greek Bishop, in which one pulled the other's beard, July 7, 1546,¹² and certain sarcastic remarks spoken in anger by some exasperated prelate in defense of his own views or the so-called rights of his sovereign.¹³

⁹ Page 360.

¹⁰ Pages 507, 508.

¹¹ Page 543.

¹² Page 90.

¹³ Pages 99, 100, 133, 326, 383, 477, 535, etc.

When Father Theiner published his *Acta*, non-Catholics accused him of omitting intentionally all that might militate against the Church, although he really did his utmost to write objective history. He was seriously hampered by a rigorous censorship, and his ignorance of some very important documents. To set at rest forever all suspicion of a *suppressio veri*, and to answer satisfactorily the fables, calumnies, and false conjectures current among anti-Catholic controversialists, the scholars of the Goerres Society have determined to publish every document that relates to the Council. The proposed volumes of the series will treat in detail the *Diaries* (vols. i-iii), the *Acta* (vols. iv-ix), the *Epistles* (vols. x-xii), and the *Treatises* of the theologians and canonists (vol. xiii).

The diaries are perhaps the best possible sources for a complete history of the Council. For as they were written for the author's eye alone, and not for the general public, they are apt to be truthful, sincere, and devoid of all human respect. They are of special value in the present instance, for they were written not merely by the friends, but also by the enemies, of the Roman Curia, and their authors are not merely prejudiced Italians, but Spaniards, Frenchmen, Belgians, and Germans.

A new edition of the *Acta* was absolutely necessary, for Father Theiner's arbitrary editing rendered his edition practically useless from the standpoint of scholarship, and he made no use of the *Acta* of Massarelli, the secretary-general of the Council, which re-

corded the *vota* of the congregations and the speeches made at every session.

Some of the letters of the ambassadors, legates, and other members of the Council have already been published, and they form, as can readily be seen, an excellent commentary on its proceedings. Many of the most important letters that passed between the legates and the Roman Curia are here published for the first time. The final volume will give us all the important treatises of theologians and canonists—such as Nausea, Campeggio, and Sirleto—which were written either before or during the Council. They played an important part in directing the discussion of certain dogmas and laws, and they bring out clearly the full force of the different decrees.

Throughout these volumes all the variant and doubtful readings are given on every page, and copious critical notes furnish us brief but accurate biographical sketches of all the personages mentioned in the text. The editors also point out the differences in the various codices of the original documents, the epitomes and the commentators, the writers who discuss the theology, the Scriptural texts, and the canon law alluded to in the text.

The first volume of the *Diaries* is edited by Sebastian Merkle, who writes a very scholarly Introduction of one hundred and twenty-nine pages. The text itself consists of five documents, namely, the *Commentary* of the Council of Trent by Hercole Severolo, the Procurator of the Council (December 11, 1545, to

January 16, 1548), and the four diaries of Angelo Massarelli, the secretary-general of the Council (vol. i, February 22, 1545, to December 13, 1545; vol. ii, February 6, 1545, to March 11, 1547; vol. iii, December 18, 1545, to March 11, 1547; vol. iv, March 12, 1547, to November 10, 1549).

The Introduction consists of four chapters. Chapter I discusses the reasons that prompted the publication of the present work, gives a list of all the documents edited, and the European libraries in which they may be found, and enumerates the seven diaries of Massarelli, only two of which had hitherto been published by Döllinger.

Chapter II deals with the *Commentary* of Severolo. Father Merkle proves its authenticity, discusses its origin, character, and purpose, and gives a complete list of all the codices of the work, with a critical estimate of their value. He then writes a brief biographical sketch of the author, setting forth his accuracy and his trustworthiness. He next speaks of the epitome of this *Commentary*, which Massarelli used in compiling his *Acta*, and makes a comparative critical study of the *Commentary*, the *Epitome*, and the *Acta*. The *Commentary* of Severolo is the only original source we possess of the first four months of the Council (December 11, 1545, to April 1, 1546). Neither Sarpi nor Pallavicino knew of its existence, and Raynaldi, the only writer who has hitherto made use of it, did not know who wrote it.

Chapter III gives a brief sketch of the life of Man-

sarelli, and analyzes his chief works, viz., his *Acta* of the Council, his seven diaries, and his letters to the Cardinals of the Curia. The secretary of the Council was not a very brilliant scholar, but he was a well-educated cleric, an indefatigable worker, and ever most active in ecclesiastical affairs. A man of more cultivated taste or greater ability—he makes frequent mistakes in Latin—would have omitted many of the gossipy and trivial details, which he relates with all the gusto of a modern newspaper reporter. He tells us about a murder and a robbery at Trent; the great entertainments given on feast days in the line of jousting, fireworks, and walking the tight-rope; the menus of the banquets given in honor of distinguished guests; the state of the weather; the high cost of living; the quarrels about precedence; fishing trips, deer hunts, horse racing, etc.

Every one who reads these diaries carefully will acknowledge that Massarelli was a simple, honest man, although, like most of the Italians of his day, he was unable to distinguish between the divine authority of the Church and the political policies of the Pope and the Roman Curia.¹⁴ When, for example, Charles V, the better to win over the Protestants, earnestly and persistently demanded the return of the Council from Bologna to Trent, Massarelli calls him a persecutor of the Church on a par with the old Roman emperors, and prophesies for him a miserable and violent death. Again, he taxes with stupidity or deliberate malice

¹⁴ Page lxxx.

every bishop who honestly opposed in Council the wishes of the Roman Cardinals, and he accuses the opponents of the legates of ingratitude or heresy. Still, it is unjust to accuse him, as some have done, of continually making false statements of fact, or of deliberately failing to record accurately the *vota* of the bishops. The editors of the present work have detected him in only one deliberate falsehood,¹⁵ and declare that his mistakes—if they exist—in recording the *vota* were due to the inadvertence of a sick and busy secretary. We readily admit that he was guilty of many errors in judgment, and that he occasionally voiced his prejudices in pretty strong language.¹⁶ The reader will readily pardon him because of his evident sincerity.

Chapter IV gives us the reasons which prompted the editors to publish the text of all the original documents in its integrity. They argue—and rightly—that it is fairer and more satisfactory to allow the reader to form his own judgment upon the data as a whole, than to make excerpts requiring lengthy and perhaps partisan explanations. The critical editing of the text, with a complete list of all the various readings, was in itself a gigantic task, and will prove most helpful to the future historian of the Council.

During the first quarter of the sixteenth century, the Catholic world was talking of the necessity of a General Council to reform the flagrant abuses that had

¹⁵ Page 818, line 32; page 825, note 2.

¹⁶ Page 232, line 28; page 383, line 20, etc.

crept into the Church, and to determine once for all the true Gospel of Christ in opposition to the errors of the reformers, which were unsettling the minds of thousands. The Popes were rather slow in answering the popular demand for a General Council, because they felt that the times were unfavorable. Many worldly clerics were utterly opposed to reform of any kind; the Emperor was afraid of antagonizing the Protestant princes by the publishing of conciliar decrees denouncing the Lutheran errors; the continual wars between Charles V and Francis I made it difficult for the bishops to assemble and to agree upon the place of meeting; the Popes were afraid of a repetition of the schismatic proceedings of the Council of Basle.

Pope Paul III, however, was determined that the Council should be held. He convoked it in 1536 to meet in Mantua, May, 1537, but owing to the very strong opposition against it, he was obliged to pro-
rogue it for six months. It was then deferred for various reasons to meet at Vicenza, May, 1538, and again at Trent, November, 1542. The three legates sent in this year waited many months for the bishops to arrive, but, as they failed to appear, the Council was again suspended until March, 1545. It was finally opened, December 13, 1545, by the three legates, Giammaria del Monte, Cardinal Bishop of Palestrina, Marcello Cervini, Cardinal Priest of Santa Croce, and Reginald Pole, Cardinal Priest of Santa Maria in Cosmedin. There were present at the opening ses-

sion four archbishops, twenty bishops, five generals of religious orders, two ambassadors of King Ferdinand, Pighini, the auditor of the Roman Rota, and Severolo, the procurator of the Council.¹⁷ The Emperor's ambassador, Didaco de Mendoza, unable to attend because of sickness, begged the Council to excuse him. Because of the small number of bishops present, nothing was accomplished at the first session save the public reading of the Papal Bull of convocation, and the mandate of the Papal legates.

The interval between the first and second sessions (December 13, 1545, to January 7, 1546) was spent in discussing questions of precedence, the credentials of those seeking admission to the Council, the method of voting, the mode of procedure, and the like. The legates insisted strongly upon the superiority of the Pope over the Council, which had been questioned at Basle, and declared that they presided in his name. The motion of the Bishop of Fiesole to add the words: "Representing the Universal Church" to the title "Sacred Ecumenical Council" was defeated, after a good deal of argument, as misleading and unnecessary. The bishops then elected all the officials of the Council, viz., a procurator, a secretary-general, a lay protector, two notaries, and two *scrutatores* to count the votes. Congregations of theologians and canonists were appointed to prepare the *schemata* of the doctrinal and disciplinary decrees, that were to be discussed and voted upon by the General Congregation of

¹⁷ Page 4.

Bishops. The old custom of individual voting, which had been set aside at Constance on account of the great Western Schism, was again adopted. One vote was given to each of the generals of the religious orders, and to every three abbots. The Public Session announced the final result of the discussions of the General Congregations, and formulated the decrees and canons.

The third session (February 4, 1546)¹⁸ published a decree upon the Nicene Creed, and another on the obligation of attending the Council. For about a month the bishops had discussed the mode of procedure to be followed in their deliberations. They found it difficult to decide whether matters of doctrine or discipline should take precedence in the discussion and framing of the decrees. A compromise was finally effected, and they decided to treat both doctrine and discipline together. As a matter of fact, the Council published two decrees, the one on doctrine and the other on discipline, at nearly every public session.¹⁹ During the next two months the Sacred Scriptures formed the sole topic of discussion.

The fourth session (April 8, 1546)²⁰ formulated the two decrees that settled finally the relation between the Bible and tradition, the canon, the use of the Latin Vulgate, and the rules of Biblical interpre-

¹⁸ Pages 27, 434, 476.

¹⁹ Page 20, *et seq.*

²⁰ Page 534. There were present at this session five cardinals, eight archbishops, forty-one bishops, three generals of religious orders, and two abbots.

tation. The preliminary discussions are given in the most minute detail in Massarelli's third diary.²¹ One has only to read these well-reported speeches to see at a glance how false are many of the statements made by prejudiced non-Catholics regarding the meaning of the Tridentine decrees. Take, for example, the question of the authority of the Latin Vulgate. It was explicitly stated²² that in declaring the Vulgate the authentic edition to be used in preaching, disputations, and theological lectures, the Council did not thereby reject all other editions as false, but merely asserted its superiority over them. It, moreover, admitted the fact that many errors had crept into the original text, and requested the Pope to order these mistakes corrected as soon as possible. One of the bishops is recorded as saying that Christ and His Apostles used the very words of the Vulgate—a statement which our editor questions, although it is also recorded in the *Acta*.

The fifth session (June 17, 1546)²³ formulated first a decree on original sin. It declared that Adam by his fall had lost his original holiness and justice, and had deteriorated in both soul and body; that the sin of Adam had injured not only himself but all his descendants; that it had been transmitted to them by propagation; that the effects of Adam's sin are wholly

²¹ Pages 476-523.

²² Page 527.

²³ Page 80. There were present at this session four cardinals, nine archbishops, fifty bishops, three generals of religious orders, and two abbots.

taken away by the merits of Jesus Christ and His grace in baptism; that the concupiscence which still remains in man, has never been called sin by the Catholic Church, but that it comes from sin and inclines thereto; that this decree has no reference whatever to the dogma of the Immaculate Conception.

Most of the discussions preliminary to the fifth session ²⁴ dealt with the decree on discipline, which had reference to the teaching of the Holy Scriptures, and the preaching of the Gospel by bishops, priests, and regulars. Some very bitter speeches were made regarding the duty of episcopal residence, and the preaching of regulars without episcopal approval. Pietro Pachecci, the Bishop of Jaén, and Braccio Martello, Bishop of Fiesole, were the chief offenders. Both Cardinal del Monte, the presiding legate, and Cardinal Pole rebuked the Bishop of Fiesole on account of his "seditious, calumnious, quarrelsome, and illogical discourses." ²⁵ They told him plainly that he was calumniating the Holy See by accusing it of granting privileges to the regulars contrary to the divine law, and that he was schismatical and heretical in spirit by attempting to limit unduly the Pope's power in their regard. The General of the Servites was the chief defender of the rights and privileges of the religious orders, and although his challenges were at times a bit vehement and melodramatic in tone, his points were well taken. He said in conclusion: "I wish the Council to consider carefully all the privileges granted by

²⁴ Pages 50-80.

²⁵ Pages 56, 57.

the Pope to the regulars. If the bishops assembled consider them harmful to the Church, we are willing to be deprived of them.”²⁶

The sixth session (January 13, 1547)²⁷ gives us the results of six months’ discussion in the form of a lengthy doctrinal decree on justification, and a disciplinary decree emphasizing the duty of episcopal residence and visitation.²⁸ The presiding legate expressly stated, in view of some rather angry discussions, that the Council did not convene to settle any controversies of the schools on questions of grace, but to condemn the errors and heresies of the reformers on justification.²⁹ They wished particularly to denounce Luther’s heretical teaching on justification by faith alone, imputative justice, the slave will, election, merit, good works, etc.

The untiring and irrepressible Bishop of Fiesole made so many speeches that he finally wore out the patience of his listeners. Once, when he asked leave to speak, the presiding legate, with a twinkle in his eye, said: “I will *always* give His Grace of Fiesole permission to say whatever he desires,” whereat all the Council, seeing his point, laughed heartily.³⁰

The Cardinal of Trent lost his temper during a heated argument with Cardinal del Monte, and afterwards, while asking pardon for his vehemence, got

²⁶ Pages 59, 63.

²⁷ Pages 121, 458, 601. There were present at this session four cardinals, ten archbishops, and forty-five bishops.

²⁸ Pages 82-120, 440-458, 564-603.

²⁹ Page 108.

³⁰ Page 124.

angry again because the legate did not deign to reply, but merely nodded his head.³¹ The presiding legate's kindly, dignified, and firm treatment of all the bishops is an evidence of one great quality of Pope Paul III—the power of selecting capable men to carry out his will.

The seventh session (March 3, 1547)³² published a doctrinal decree on the sacraments in general, baptism and confirmation, and a disciplinary decree on matters connected with episcopal residence. The Council forbade the holding of incompatible benefices and set forth the conditions required for valid appointments thereunto.

It is very interesting to note how the subject matter for the doctrinal decrees of this session was originally presented by the theologians. They submitted fifty-one questions for the consideration of the bishops, which they divided into three sections: theses which are absolutely heretical; theses which many theologians declare should not be condemned without some explanation; and theses which some theologians believe should not be condemned, but entirely ignored.

The eighth session (March 11, 1547)³³ did not publish any decrees. The legates declared the Council adjourned and transferred it to Bologna, alleging the existence of a pestilence, which, according to the

³¹ Page 100.

³² Pages 124-136, 458-465, 601-621. There were present at this session three cardinals, nine archbishops, fifty-one bishops, five generals of religious orders, and two abbots.

³³ Page 142.

Council's physician, was then threatening the city. The bishops of the Emperor's party voted unanimously against the transfer, and declared that under no circumstances would they stir from Trent. They declared, in great anger, that the pestilence was a myth, and that the real reason of the transfer was the unfriendliness that had arisen between the Pope and the Emperor.

As a matter of fact, they were estranged at this time, and remained so until the death of Paul III. The Pope bitterly resented the Emperor's refusal to give the investiture of Parma and Piacenza to his relative, Pierluigi Farnese,³⁴ and was angry at the Emperor's continued interference in theological matters. Charles V, in the manner of one of the old Byzantine emperors, tried to settle the doctrinal differences between Catholics and Protestants by his own authority. The famous *Interim* of Augsburg,³⁵ May 15, 1548, mentioned frequently in the text, allowed Protestants to receive the Eucharist under both kinds, the married Protestant clergy to keep their wives, and the princes to retain the stolen ecclesiastical property. As might be expected, this decree satisfied no one. The Catholics rightly maintained that the Emperor had no right whatever to make concessions, and the Protestants denied the power of a General Council to legislate concerning their affairs.

It was stigmatized by the Protestant party as "a

³⁴ Pages 244, 248, 310, 692.

³⁵ Pages 761, 762, 765-767, 771-773, 779, 831.

fornication with the whore of Babylon, a work of the devil, a revival of Papistry, and a scheme to undermine the pure faith."

The fourth diary⁸⁶ treats of the ninth (April 21, 1547) and tenth (June 2, 1547) sessions of the Council held at Bologna. No decrees were formulated at either session, although for eight months the theologians discussed the five sacraments of Extreme Unction, Orders, Matrimony, Penance, and the Eucharist, besides the Catholic teaching on Purgatory and Indulgences.

Continual protests were made by the Emperor and the thirteen bishops of his party, who were still at Trent, against the validity of the transfer,⁸⁷ and although the Pope refused to consider their objections, their opposition prevented anything being accomplished at Bologna. Massarelli remained in the city until October 6, 1540,⁸⁸ but most of his time was spent in writing up his diaries and the *Acta* of the Council, and acting as inquisitor in a number of heresy trials. The diary closes with the death of Pope Paul III, November 10, 1549.

⁸⁶ Pages 626-873.

⁸⁷ Pages 737, 757.

⁸⁸ Page 867.

CARDINAL ALLEN¹

THE old Protestant notion of the settlement of religion under Elizabeth as the joyous rebound of the whole nation from a hatred of superstition to the pure truth of Calvinism and Zwinglianism, has been proved false in the light of contemporary evidence now open to the scholars of the world. Objective writers—Catholic and non-Catholic alike—have repudiated the unfair and dishonest version of Burnet, Macaulay, and Creighton, and have shown conclusively that the change in religion brought about by Elizabeth and her three ministers, Cecil, Walsingham, and Bacon, was due to coercion of the cruelest kind, which thought nothing of principle, or of human life and suffering. The one Englishman who did more than any other to offset the reforming zeal of Elizabeth, and save from utter wreck the remnants of the ancient faith, was William Allen, Principal of St. Mary's Hall, Oxford, President of Douay and of Rheims, and Cardinal.

Of the three great Tudor Cardinals—Wolsey, Pole, and Allen—Allen is the least known. Yet he was Wolsey's superior as a scholar, and Pole's superior as a writer and a controversialist. Strangely enough,

¹ *An Elizabethan Cardinal, William Allen.* By Martin Haile. St. Louis: B. Herder.

each of them failed to accomplish the chief task he had determined upon. Wolsey unwisely lent himself to Henry VIII's dishonest scheme of the divorce, which led eventually to the breach with Rome; Pole lived to see his work nullified by the folly of Mary's Spanish marriage and her overzeal which threatened the stability of his work; and Allen in his last years let himself be drawn into the political arena, which was, as our author says, "to fill up the cup of sorrows of his afflicted fellow-Catholics in England, by throwing into it the seeds of fierce and bitter interne-cine political strife."

Cardinal Allen came of an ancient and honorable race of the Allens of Rossall Grange and Toderstaffe Hall, in the county of Lancashire. His ancestors had lived on the same spot for centuries, comfortable country gentlemen, leading useful and God-fearing lives. William Allen was born at Rossall Grange, which his family held on lease from the abbots of Dieulacres, in 1532. He was educated at home, under the watchful eye of his parents, until his fifteenth year, when he was entered at Oriel College, Oxford. His academical career was noted for the rapidity of his advancement in learning, his extraordinary industry and exactness under discipline, and the singular modesty and integrity of his life. He became Bachelor of Arts in 1550, and was in the same year unanimously elected Fellow of his college. Whitaker, in his history of Richmondshire,² says, that to obtain

² Vol. i, p. 444.

his degree, Allen must "at least, have professed himself of the reformed religion," but there is not the slightest evidence of his apostasy: in fact, whatever evidence there is points the other way. A conjecture made two centuries after the event ought to be set aside as worthless, especially when we know fully the nature of the man. Allen's College is mentioned by Turner, afterwards Dean of Wells, as "a stronghold of Popery" at this very time. In 1556, Allen was chosen Principal of St. Mary's Hall, and Proctor of the University. Whether he ever met Cardinal Pole is uncertain, but that the fame of his attainments and learning had reached the Chancellor of the University is beyond question. It is most probable that the canonry of York conferred upon Allen, still a layman, in 1558, was bestowed through the influence of Cardinal Pole.

Elizabeth came to the throne, November 17, 1558. With a packed Parliament and a subservient House of Lords, she succeeded in passing three bills, which effected the severance with Rome, established the Royal Supremacy, and decreed uniformity of worship according to the revised second Prayer Book of Edward VI. "The battle raged so fiercely over the Supremacy Bill, and passions were so aroused by it, that it has become impossible to follow the measure through all the stages and changes necessitated by violent and strenuous opposition in both houses."⁸ The Act of Uniformity was opposed by the whole bench of bish-

⁸ Dom Birt, *Settlement of Religion Under Elizabeth*, p. 90.

ops, and by nine lay peers; several of the latter must have absented themselves, on one pretext or another, for that momentous measure was passed by a majority of only three votes. The bill thus became a law without a single episcopal vote in its favor. When the Oath of Supremacy was tendered to the bishops, they all, with the one exception of Kitchen of Llandaff, declined to take it, and were at once deposed from their sees. The majority of the clergy followed the example of their prelates, and refused to take the oath. The Universities of Oxford and Cambridge were equally loyal to the old faith, but Elizabeth simply removed the heads of houses and professors just as she had deposed the bishops, and men of the New Learning were put in their place. William Allen stayed at Oxford until 1561; his departure then became inevitable, as his biographer and secretary, Nicholas Fitzherbert, tells us, on account of his untiring zeal in encouraging the timid to steadfastness, and in giving counsel to the doubting to stand firm against heretical attacks.

After a year in Flanders, he fell ill, and was advised by his physicians to try his native air, as the only means of saving his life. With the penal laws in full force, the remedy would appear to have been little less dangerous than the disease. He went to England fully aware of the risks he ran, for he was most anxious to help counteract the evil effects of the legislative alteration of religion. In those early days of doubt and hesitancy, many Catholics were sheltering

themselves under what was known as "occasional conformity." Both priests and people persuaded themselves, as Allen put it later in a letter to Bishop Vendeville, "that it was enough to hold the faith interiorly while obeying the sovereign in externals, especially in the singing of psalms and parts of Scripture in the vulgar tongue, a thing which seemed to them indifferent, and, in persons otherwise virtuous, worthy of toleration on account of the terrible rigor of the laws."⁴

The question of occasional conformity was submitted to the Pope, Paul IV, who decided, as might be expected, that there could be no compromise with heresy, and no alliance between the ancient Church and the sect of the day. William Allen finding "that not only laymen, who believed the faith in their hearts, and heard Mass when they could, frequented the schismatical churches . . . but many priests said Mass privately and celebrated the heretical offices and Supper in public,"⁵ set to work at once to combat this fast-spreading error. Although a mere layman, he was listened to as one speaking with authority, a fact which speaks volumes for the estimate in which he was held at this early date by his Catholic fellow-countrymen. He went from house to house, insisting on obedience to the commands of the Holy See, and circulated in manuscript his treatise on the authority of the Church, which was printed abroad two years

⁴ September 16, 1580.

⁵ Knox, *The Douay Diaries*, vol. i, p. 23.

later under the title *Certain Brief Reasons Concerning the Catholic Faith*. He remained in England two years, and so stiffened the resolution of the Catholics in Lancashire, that it remained, according to his enemies, for three centuries "a hotbed of Popery," and furnished him the chief supporters in England of the seminaries he was to establish abroad. Such activity incited the wrath of the authorities, who did their utmost to apprehend him. He was forced to go in turn to Oxfordshire, and Norfolk; and after a brief visit to Oxford, he escaped to the Continent, never to return.

He went at once to Malines, where he was ordained priest in 1565. In May of that year, he published his well-known work, *A Defence and Declaration of the Catholic Church's Doctrine Touching Purgatory and Prayers for the Souls Departed*. He made Malines his home for the next two years, lecturing on theology at the College of the Benedictines. His book on Purgatory soon came to the notice of Elizabeth, and a warrant was at once issued for his arrest. While the Queen's writ was being published, Father Allen wrote another book on *Confession and Indulgences*—some four hundred and twelve pages—which put him in the very first rank of the controversialists of the day. Scholarly, clear, lucid, accurate, he always wrote with the tenderest love for those who had made shipwreck of the old faith. In the fall of 1567 he made a pilgrimage to Rome with his old master at Oriel, Morgan Philipps, and Dr. Vendeville, then

Regius Professor of Canon Law at the University of Douay, and later on Bishop of Tournay. Dr. Vendeville had wished to lay before the Pope, St. Pius V, a plan for the conversion of infidels, but the Pope was too busy at the time to give him an audience. On his way home, he expressed his disappointment to his friend, Father Allen, who at once took the opportunity of pleading the cause of his persecuted brethren in England. The result of this conversation was the founding of the College of Douay, which was to accomplish so much for the preservation of the faith in England during the days of persecution.

The college was opened on Michaelmas Day, 1568. The Papal confirmation and approval being granted a few months later, Father Allen was made president, and Bristow, "his right hand," a fellow of Exeter College, became his prefect of studies. The first members of the college were two Belgians, Raverton and Colier, who with John Marshall, Dean of Christ Church, left shortly, because the poverty of the college was more than they could stand. Some of the other pioneers were Risdon, who later on joined the English Carthusians at Bruges; Wright, who labored long on the English Mission; Storey, who became a Jesuit; Darell, of New College, and Morgan Philipps, of Oriel; Stapleton, the controversialist, and Campion, the martyr. Father Allen's seminary was really the first seminary established under the new rules promulgated by the Council of Trent. The course of study was as generous as the diet was meager. Spe-

cial attention was paid to the study of the Bible, the history of the Church, and the controversies of the day, every student looking forward with gladness to the day when he would be sent to face death on the English mission.

During the first ten years of its existence—1568–1578—the college sent forth from its walls seventy-four priests, fifteen of whom died for the faith. Cuthbert Mayne enjoys the distinction of being the proto-martyr, and the story of his life may be found in Dr. Allen's *Brief History of the Glorious Martyrdom of Twelve Reverend Priests*, published in 1582. The college had to struggle along in the direst poverty for some years, for Elizabeth had prohibited the sending of money from England, and many of the English exiles had suffered on account of the failure of the Northern Insurrection, and the revolutionary movement in the Netherlands. The Pope came to its rescue with a pension of one hundred gold crowns a month, equivalent to one thousand crowns at the present day. This was in 1576. Everything was in a most flourishing condition at this time, for there were eighty English students in the seminary and sixty at the university. But within two years the revolutionary party came into power in Douay, and a new governor appointed by the Prince of Orange and the States, commanded all the English to depart. In the Holy Week of 1578, the College was transferred to Rheims. Within eight months the Calvinistic faction was expelled, and the city and the magistrates, rep-

resenting the old order of things, asked Dr. Allen to return. He refused, for another removal would have been troublesome and expensive, and the state of the Low Countries was far from being settled.

Knox, in his historical preface to the *Letters and Memorials of Cardinal Allen*, says that Allen's political activities only began about the year 1582, but later investigations make it plain that they dated at least six years earlier. Still, he never allowed the peace and quiet of his college to be disturbed by any mention of politics. Nothing perhaps is more remarkable in his career than the rigid separation he maintained between his life as president of the seminary, and his life as a prominent factor in affairs of State. He forbade absolutely all political discussions among the students, and all allusions in school questions and controversies to the vexed question of depriving and excommunicating princes.

Dr. Allen was certainly most active in political schemes for the furtherance of the cause of Mary, Queen of Scots, and the overthrow of Elizabeth. When Gregory XIII consented to have an expedition sent to England in his name, with one of the Colonnas as Captain General, he summoned Dr. Allen to Rome for consultation. Gregory XIII was only paying back Elizabeth in her own coin when he sent aid to her revolted subjects, but aggressions so feeble and poorly planned as those of Stuckley, Fitzgerald, and San Giuseppe, might, as our author says, "well excite the risibility as well as the anger of the terrible queen."

Had Philip II given his aid at the time, these attempts might have been successful, but to act without him was pure folly. If, as seems probable, Dr. Allen advised the sending of these expeditions, we cannot think highly of his political sagacity.

Again we find Dr. Allen in Paris in the year 1582, busying himself with the schemes of Esme Stuart, Lord of Aubigny, and cousin to the King of Scotland, James VI. Two years were spent in trying to interest the King of Spain and the Duke of Guise in Aubigny's plan for the overthrow of Elizabeth, but the affair came to the knowledge of the English government, and the Duke of Lennox died without accomplishing anything. We know that Dr. Allen wrote most enthusiastically of this enterprise to the Pope, Gregory XIII, describing two interviews that he had had with the Duke of Guise in Paris. He seemed to share with Father Persons the opinion that the majority of the people in England were prepared to rise against their queen on the mere appearance of French or Spanish troops. Father Persons' influence on Dr. Allen was supreme, and the latter's long absence from his native land had caused him to get out of touch with the deepest instincts of the nation, despite the constant intercourse that went on between Rheims and England.

Another instance which shows how foreign were his ways of thinking to the majority of his Catholic fellow-countrymen, was his written defense of the treason of Sir William Stanley, who had delivered

Deventer over to the King of Spain. Dr. Allen characterized this treason as "a lawful and a laudable act," which so astounded many Catholics in England that they deemed his work "a forgery of some malicious man to make our cause odious to the world."

Memorandum after memorandum was laid before the Pope by the Spanish Ambassador, Olivares, urging the elevation of Dr. Allen to the purple, because of his staunch advocacy of the claims of Philip II to the English crown, and as a first step towards the long talked-of English expedition. The Pope finally yielded in the Consistory of August 7, 1587, in the hope that Philip's attack upon England would be made without delay. But the dilatory King allowed a year to go by, thus giving Elizabeth ample time to prepare. Dr. Allen himself expressly states that his cardinalate was due to Jesuit influence at the Court of Spain, and chiefly to Philip's great friend, Father Persons. It is rather pathetic now to read of Cardinal Allen's drawing up a paper for the guidance of the King, containing "suggestions as to the way of filling up the churches and offices of the King and kingdom of England, if God gives the success which is hoped for from His mercy." The Armada went to its defeat a year later, and the English Catholics, despite their cruel treatment by Elizabeth, were loyal to a man in repelling the Spanish invaders.

To his dying day, Cardinal Allen remained convinced that the only hope for England lay in Spanish interference. We can imagine his chagrin, therefore,

at the utter defeat of the Armada, and Philip's abandonment of the enterprise. Our author regrets—and rightly, too—that Cardinal Allen should have ever combined his successful spiritual welfare, which he so well understood, with a disastrous political campaign which he understood so little.

Cardinal Allen's tact and large-mindedness are never so apparent as in his dealings with the dissensions in the English College at Rome. From the outset the English students were ever setting forth their grievances, whether the college was under the Welshman, Dr. Clenock, who was singularly lacking in the talent of governing, or under the Italian Jesuits, who were disliked because of "the open penances in hall, and the surveillance and espionage, which," as Ely says in his *Certain Brief Notes*, "had they been attempted at Oxford and Cambridge, the offenders would have risked being torn to pieces." A third reason was the favor supposedly shown to those students who showed any inclination to join the Society.

As a matter of fact, sixty-nine Englishmen had become Jesuits between the years 1556 and 1580, and yet the number sent into England had been surprisingly small. Mr. Haile writes:

"There were seldom more than four or five Jesuits at a time in England, and even so late as 1598, eighteen years after Campion and Persons arrived in the country, they numbered only sixteen, of whom one was in prison. The same proportion held good among

those who fell in defense of the faith. During the forty-four years of Elizabeth's reign, although the persecution raged even more hotly against the Jesuits than the seculars, one hundred and sixty seminary priests were martyred to seven Jesuits, one Benedictine and one Franciscan. Of the Jesuits, four—Father Briant, John Cornelius, Roger Filcock, and Francis Page—were all secular priests who joined the Society shortly before their death."

Cardinal Allen was always called upon to play the rôle of peacemaker. We find him called to Rome to restore harmony and good will between the students and the authorities in 1579, and again six years later he pours oil upon the waters by having the Pope, Sixtus V, appoint William Holt, an English Jesuit, to take the place of the Italian Father Agazzari.

Besides the four works already mentioned, Cardinal Allen wrote a Latin *Treatise on the Sacraments*, which was highly esteemed and used by Cardinal Bellarmine; an *Apology* for the two English colleges of Rheims and Rome; a *Life of Father Campion*; a *Defense of English Catholics*, against the lying and slanderous pamphlet of Lord Burleigh; ⁶ *Instructions Concerning the Government of Seminaries*, and probably the famous *Admonition*, which the appellant priests ascribed to Father Persons. His controversial writings so angered the English government, that it not only issued a writ for his arrest, but did its utmost to have Henry III deliver him into its hands. Secre-

* Published lately by the Catholic Library of England.

tary Walsingham had deputed, moreover, the notorious Egremont Radcliffe to assassinate Dr. Allen, as well as Don Juan of Austria, as Radcliffe himself confessed on the scaffold. Removal by assassination seems to have been part of the politics of the sixteenth century, for we recall Catherine de Medici's attempt upon Coligny, which prepared the way for the massacre of St. Bartholomew, and Philip II's approval of the plan to assassinate Elizabeth. Many politicians of that day looked upon the murder of an enemy not as a crime, but as an act of war, as part and parcel of the general attack upon an enemy against whom hostilities were opening. It is hard for us at the present time to realize this viewpoint, and it is good to remember that the Popes never gave the slightest countenance to such a false and brutal doctrine. Pope Pius V has indeed been accused by non-Catholic controversialists of advocating assassination with regard to the Huguenot leaders in France, and with regard to Elizabeth in England, but not the slightest evidence has ever been brought forward for this false accusation.

Ever since the Council of Trent had declared the Latin Vulgate the authentic version of the Sacred Scriptures, the Popes had been anxious to publish a corrected recension. Pius IV had appointed a commission of Cardinals for that purpose. In 1579 Cardinal Montalto urged upon Gregory XIII the importance of preparing a more correct edition of the Septuagint as a preliminary to the recension of the

Vulgate. Cardinal Caraffa was appointed to take up the matter, and among the scholars whom he chose to assist him is found the name of Cardinal Allen. How much work he did on this commission is not known, but he must have spent some time upon it during his five months' stay in Rome during the winter of 1579-1580, and again on his return in 1585. This corrected edition of the Septuagint was finally published by Sixtus V in 1587. He was unable to complete the Vulgate, for we find Pope Gregory XIV appointing a new commission in 1591. Fitzherbert speaks of Cardinal Allen's labors on this commission, as well as his work in the two Congregations of the Index and the Affairs of Germany. On the death of Cardinal Caraffa, Cardinal Allen was appointed by the Pope apostolic librarian. One of his labors in this office was the correcting of the text of St. Augustine, which he undertook in coöperation with other scholars. Death alone prevented him from completing it.

We must not forget that we owe our English Bible to Cardinal Allen. Soon after the transference of the English College to Rheims, he commissioned Gregory Martin to work on a translation of the Bible. Personally he preferred to keep the Scriptures in the original, but as many corrupt versions were in circulation, he deemed it necessary to have a faithful and correct text that Catholics might trust. Martin began his translation on October 16, 1578, and it was revised and corrected page by page, as it proceeded, by Bristow and Cardinal Allen. The New Testament

was completed in March, 1582, and the Old Testament in 1611, Dr. Allen collecting all the necessary funds—about \$25,000—for the publication.

Martin did his work well. Henceforth the English-speaking Catholics were to have a correct translation of the Bible, which they could confidently quote in answer to the faulty Protestant versions, gotten up to promote the theological errors and heresies of their translators. It put an end to the many Protestant versions then in use, and caused the publishing of the King James Version of 1611. The translators of the Authorized Version made great use of the labors of Gregory Martin, as is clear from their adoption of many of his renderings.

Some superficial writers have spoken of the Douay Bible as overloaded with Latinism, and have ascribed this fault to the fact that the translators and revisers were exiles, who had grown unfamiliar with their native tongue. Martin forestalled this objection by declaring that he followed the Vulgate to the best of his ability, because it had been declared authentic by the Council of Trent. He preferred to follow a bit closely the Latin text, rather than endanger the true sense by the use of more familiar words. All concerned with the translation were Oxford men, and all but Allen himself had but lately left the university. Scholars of late have come to acknowledge the excellent English of the Douay Bible. As a writer in *The Catholic World*, November, 1870, well says: "Martin's translation is terse, close, vigorous, grand old

English of the very best era of English literature, coeval with Shakespeare, Ben Jonson, and Spenser."

Cardinal Allen will always be held in reverence for his scholarship, his skill and earnestness in controversy, his indefatigable labors in maintaining the faith in England by his continual supply of learned and holy missionaries, his translation of the Bible, and his general character of sweetness and charm of manner which did so much to quiet the dissensions of the English Catholics of his time. His one fault was his entering into politics, for which he was absolutely unfitted, and his submitting to being made a tool of by the King of Spain. His political prejudices were with him even to the last, for one year before his death we find him drawing up a strong indictment against Henry of Navarre for his "pretended" conversion. Luckily for France and for the peace of Europe, Clement VIII believed in Henry's sincerity. The Pope's solemn absolution of the King ended the thirty years of religious wars in France, and made France a powerful ally of the Holy See.

THE CONDEMNATION OF GALILEO

WE can readily understand how in the seventeenth century the condemnation of Galileo caused a stir out of proportion to the real merits of the case. For that age was preëminently the age of transition. The natural sciences—physics, astronomy, and mechanics—were still in their infancy, and were studied simply as divisions of philosophy. They were looked upon as useful auxiliaries, it is true, but they were without any individuality or method of their own.

Galileo, although not the first, was the most energetic and the most prominent defender of the new physical sciences, which were based no longer on the authority of Aristotle, but on personal observation of phenomena and mathematical analysis. When he proclaimed the absolute freedom of physics and astronomy from their old-time dependence upon *a priori* speculations, and declared open war upon the indignant followers of the scholastic philosophy, they were up in arms at once, eager to combat so daring and persistent an innovator. Did not every Doctor in the schools swear by the word of the Master? Had not the physical teaching of Aristotle held the field for centuries and furnished many an exact and ingenious explanation of natural phenomena?

Again Galileo's place in the intellectual world, due

to his marvelous discoveries, his influential lay and clerical friends, especially in Tuscany and at the Papal Court; his obstinate determination to meet the theologians of his day on their own vantage ground of Biblical exegesis; the aggressiveness and bitterness wherewith he attacked every one, no matter how powerful, who dared disagree with him—these were some of the reasons that brought about his condemnation, and at the same time gave it a prominence altogether unique.

At the outset it may be of interest to give a brief historical sketch of the two sets of official documents in the archives of the Inquisition relating to the Galileo case, viz., the trials and the decrees.

The trial registers contain all the documents that were used by the theological consultors and the Inquisitors in coming to their final decision—autograph letters of accusation and defense; the official reports of the interrogatories; the various opinions of the judges; the copies of the sentences given, and the like. The decree registers contain the minutes of the various sessions of the Congregation, the arguments *pro* and *con*, and the final judicial sentence.

The records of the trial were kept at Rome in the archives of the Holy Office until the beginning of the nineteenth century, and all access to them was forbidden in accord with the traditions of that secret tribunal. In 1811, some time after the French occupation of Rome, Napoleon ordered all the records of the Inquisition sent to Paris. He commanded his libra-

rian, Barbier, to publish at once the documents in the Galileo case, but he was deterred by the difficulty of the task, and the Emperor was too busily engaged with his last campaigns to see that his orders were carried out. These papers, although asked for twice by Pius VII, did not find their way back to Rome until 1845, when they were returned to the Pope by Count Rossi, with the express condition that they be published in their entirety. Pius IX at once entrusted them to the Prefect of the Vatican Archives, Monsignor Marini, who on July 8, 1850, deposited them in the Vatican library. Thence they were transferred to the secret archives of the Vatican, where they still remain.

The promise made to Count Rossi was partially carried out in 1850 by Monsignor Marini, who published a portion of the documents in his work, *Galileo and the Inquisition, an Historical and Critical Memoir*. This edition, however, was so imperfect that it made the scholarly world feel that there were certain things in the record which the ecclesiastical authorities were anxious to hide. For nearly twenty years scholars asked Rome in vain for permission to consult these documents. This favor was finally granted in July, 1867, through the courtesy of the Vatican Librarian, Father Theiner, to Henri de l'Epinois. Soon after he published some of the most important passages in the *Revue des Questions Historiques* of Paris, with a brief summary of the remainder. A third and a fourth edition, more complete but still imperfect, were pub-

lished by Berti at Rome in 1876 and 1878. In 1877 two fairly complete editions were published, the one in Paris by Henri de l'Epinois, and the other in Stuttgart by Charles von Gebler. It was not until 1907 that a final and minutely critical text was published in Florence by A. Favaro.

The manuscripts of the decrees had also a rather interesting history. The agents of Napoleon did not find them among the papers that they carried with them to France in 1811. Scholars who felt that they must be in Rome, asked the authorities there more than once for the privilege of consulting them, but they were always met with a polite refusal.

When Pius IX went into exile at Gaeta in 1848, the Roman Constituent Assembly transferred the archives of the Inquisition to the Church of Sant' Apollinare. Two of the Roman officials, Gherardi and Manzari, went several times to look for the papers that referred to the Galileo case. They, of course, did not find the records of the trial, as they were safe in the hands of Monsignor Marini, but Gherardi did discover seventeen authentic decrees, and an eighteenth century copy of thirty-two decrees. He published them in 1867, just about the time that the records of the trial were being edited in Germany and France. It was not until thirty years later that the critical edition of Favaro was published. About the same time, 1908, Favaro also published a new edition of the works of Galileo in twenty volumes, under the auspices of the King of Italy.

It is, therefore, only in the last seven years that one can discuss the Galileo case with a perfect grasp of all the facts. All scholars writing before 1908 were unaware of the existence of some very important documents.

The most complete bibliography we possess of the Galileo case was published at Rome in 1896 by A. Carli and A. Favaro. This *Bibliografia Galileiana* gives a list of 2,108 publications with their dates.

Favaro's critical edition of the trials and the decrees is entitled *Galileo e l'Inquisizione* (Florence, 1907).

We mention here a score of the best books in the order of their publication.

Berti, Rome, 1876. *Il Processo di Galileo Galilei.*

H. de l'Epinois, Paris, 1877. *La Question de Galilée.*

Von Gebler, Stuttgart, 1877. *Die Acten des Galileischen Proceses.*

Schanz, Würzburg, 1878. *Galileo Galilei und sein Process.*

Pieralisi, Rome, 1878. *Urbano VIII e Galileo Galilei.*

Pieralisi, Rome, 1878. *Novi Observazioni sopra il Processo di Galileo.*

Reusch, Bonn, 1879. *Le Procès de Galilée et les Jésuites.*

Grisar, Ratisbon, 1882. *Galileistudien.*

Bourquard, Paris, 1886. *Galilée, son procès, sa condamnation, et les Congrégations Romaines.*

Jaugey, Paris, 1888. *Le Procès de Galilée et la Théologie.*

Vacandard, Paris, 1905. *Études des Critique et d'Histoire Religieuse.* Vol. I.

Müller, Fribourg, 1909. *Der Galilei Prozess.*

Müller, Fribourg, 1909. *Galileo Galilei, und das Kopernikanische Weltsystem.*

Aubanel, Avignon, 1910. *Galilée et l'Église.*

P. de Vréguille, Paris, 1911. *Galiléo.* An article in the *Dictionnaire Apologétique de la Foi Catholique.* Vol. II, col. 147-192.

PART I

Galileo Galilei, born at Pisa, February 18, 1564, was Professor of Physics and Mathematics at the University of Pisa, 1589-1592, and at Padua, 1592-1610. In the early days of his professorship he taught the Ptolemaic theory. When he became a convert to the Copernican theory will never be known with certainty. Some declare that it was due to the arguments of his friends, Christian Wursteisen, of Basle, and Michael Mastlin, who had been Kepler's professor. It is certain that he held it as early as 1597, for he mentions the fact in a letter to Kepler on August 4 of that year. The frequent statement that his abandonment of the old theory was due to the appearance in September, 1604, of a new star in the *Constellation Serpentarius* is now disproved.

Hans Lippershey's discovery of the telescope in

October, 1608, afforded Galileo, who at once increased its magnifying power over thirtyfold, a most effective instrument of research into the constitution and relation of the heavenly bodies.

In March, 1610, he published at Venice his *Sidereus Nuntius*, which described the mountains and valleys of the moon, the groups of lesser stars known as the Milky Way, and the four satellites of Jupiter, which he had discovered on January 7 and named *Medicea Sidera*, in honor of the Grand Duke of Tuscany, Cosmo II. This work was received with the greatest enthusiasm by the scientific world. Galileo was named honorary professor of the University of Padua, and made official mathematician of the Grand Duke. This was no mere compliment, as it gave him one of the Duke's villas for his summer residence, and an annual income of 1,000 scudi (about \$2,000). Before the end of the year he discovered the ansated or, as he thought, the triple form of Saturn, the phases of Venus and of Mars, and the spots upon the sun.

In a letter to Prince Cesi about this time he declared that this last discovery utterly destroyed Aristotle's theory of the incorruptibility of the heavenly bodies. The followers of Aristotle at once answered him, some asserting correctly that his proofs were not at all demonstrative, while others, in their prejudice, went so far as even to deny the truth of his discoveries. They maintained that they were mere optical illusions, due to the imperfection of the instrument he had used. As he put it sarcastically in one of his

letters, "some tried to drive the new planets out of the heavens by means of syllogisms."

In March, 1611, he went to Rome, where he was most cordially received by Pope Paul V, Prince Cesi, and the entire Papal court. The Academy of the Lincei admitted him to membership, and the astronomers of the Roman College discussed his discoveries with him in a most friendly manner. He dined frequently with Cardinal Farnese, Cardinal del Monte, and Cardinal Barberini, the future Pope Urban VIII.

The defenders of the Ptolemaic system were indignant at this kindly reception. They began a most energetic crusade against the Copernican theory, declaring that it was contrary to the teaching of the early Fathers and the old theologians, made little of Aristotle and the scholastic philosophy, expressly contradicted the plain words of the Sacred Scriptures (Jos. ix. 12, 13; Eccles. i. 4, 5; Eccli. xlvi. 26; Ps. xviii. 6, 7; Ps. xci. 1; Ps. ciii. 5), and was therefore evidently heretical.

It is true that Nicholas de Cusa, as far back as 1445, had published in Basle his work, *De Docta Ignorantia*, which defended the Copernican theory. He dedicated it to Cardinal Cesarini, who read the work with great pleasure and interest. Instead of his being condemned by the Roman authorities, he was made a Cardinal in 1448. But he did not put forth his theory as an objective fact, or declare that it was in perfect accord with the teaching of the Fathers and the Scriptures; he simply maintained it as an ingenious hypothesis.

Copernicus at Nuremberg in 1543 had published his *De Revolutionibus Orbium Cœlestium*, in defense of the theory that still bears his name. At the instance of Cardinal de Schomberg, it was dedicated to Pope Paul III, and by him was well received. The followers of Ptolemy never raised the slightest question about it, for its editor, Andrew Osiander, was clever enough to omit Copernicus' own preface, and substitute one of his own, which asserted—falsely, it is true—that the new theory was not defended as the objective truth, but merely as an hypothesis to aid in the study of astronomy. Galileo says in one of his letters: "While Copernicus acquired an immortal glory among a few, the vast majority laughed at him and made little of his learning." In Germany and Austria his views made little or no progress, because of the influence of Tycho-Brahé, who strenuously combated them. The Protestant world was also hostile, because of the bitter opposition of the leading Reformers, Luther and Melanchthon. In Italy, on the other hand, Pope Clement VII was rather favorable, for he had John Widmanstad defend the Copernican theory in his presence.

But Galileo was not content with holding his theory as a mere scientific hypothesis; he wished to convince the world of its objective truth. His kindly reception in Rome emboldened him to set forth his views even more strongly in two new works, *A Discourse on Floating Bodies* (Florence, 1612), and *A History of the Solar Spots* (Rome, 1613).

Towards the end of 1611 a Florentine monk, Francesco Sizi by name, published at Venice his book, *Dianoia Astronomica*, which declared that Galileo's theories were in direct contradiction to the teaching of the Scriptures. Had Galileo been prudent enough to follow the advice of his friends, who warned him earnestly "to keep out of the sacristy," he would have utterly ignored this attack. But his natural impetuosity and love of controversy made him enter the lists, and endeavor to meet the theologians on their own ground. This was a fatal mistake. The Church has always been suspicious, and rightly so, of the lay theologian, and the churchmen of that day were especially on the alert, because of the spread of the false Protestant principle of the private interpretation of the Bible.

Galileo met the objection of his opponent in a letter which he wrote to the Benedictine Father Castelli (1613). In it he gave his interpretation of the various texts of the Bible which seemed to go against his theory, and also laid down certain rules of exegesis, which were to guide the scientist and the theologian in discussing natural phenomena. Two years later he wrote to Christina of Lorraine, the mother of the Grand Duke, a defense of the Copernican theory, in which he developed the same ideas.

In his letter to Father Castelli, he said, among other things: "The Bible cannot err or deceive us; the truth of its words are absolute and unassailable. But they

who explain and interpret the Scriptures may be deceived in many ways, and commit many fatal errors by always slavishly following the literal sense of the words. By so doing they may even teach contradictory and impious doctrines and errors, for they would be forced to ascribe to God hands, feet, eyes, etc. . . .

In questions of natural science the Bible ought to take the last place. Both nature and the Bible come from God; the one has been inspired by the Holy Spirit, while the other faithfully obeys the laws established by God. But while the Bible, accommodating itself to the average intelligence of man, often speaks, and rightly so, according to appearances, and used terms that are not intended to express the absolute truth, nature conforms rigorously and invariably to the rules prescribed to it. One, therefore, ought not to cite texts of Scripture against a fact clearly proved by careful observation. . . . The Holy Spirit has no intention of teaching us through the Holy Scriptures that the sun moves or that the sun does not move. . . . Can any one maintain that the Holy Spirit wishes to teach us anything which does not concern the soul's salvation?"

Most of this letter to-day would be considered commonplace and orthodox enough, with the exception of a few statements like that expressed in the last sentence. Indeed, even at that time the theologian to whom this letter was referred by the Congregation of the Index declared that, save for three expressions, it

contained nothing worthy of condemnation, and that even these three might be interpreted in an orthodox sense.

Still this doctrine was novel to the ears of the seventeenth century, and the average theologian deemed it heretical. The Dominican Father Caccini, preaching on Josue in the Church of Santa Maria Novella in Florence, declaimed vehemently against the opinion of Galileo, which he asserted was "incompatible with the Catholic Faith, inasmuch as it contradicted several passages of the Scriptures, and was quasi-heretical." The Superior of the Dominicans apologized to Galileo for this outburst, and deplored the great folly and imprudence of the preacher. Still this open denunciation of Galileo caused a great stir not only in Florence, but all over Italy.

Galileo was very much incensed at this attack, and was anxious to bring his accuser before the Roman tribunals, but his friend, Prince Cesi, dissuaded him, for he feared that a thorough examination of the question in the present state of public opinion would result in an adverse decision. The future was to prove how well founded his suspicions were. But the opponents of the Copernican theory were nothing loath to bring the matter to the official attention of the Roman authorities.

On February 15, 1615, Father Lorini, a Dominican of Florence, sent a copy of the Castelli letter to Cardinal Sfondrati, the Prefect of the Congregation of the Index. He also sent with it a letter of his own,

in which he pointed out the erroneous expressions that he wished examined. They were as follows: "Certain expressions of the Scriptures were not accurate; in discussions of natural phenomena, the Bible held the last place; the Doctors of the Church were often deceived in their explanations; the Bible ought not to be cited in matters outside of the domain of faith; in natural science, the philosophical or astronomical argument had more force than the divine argument; the command of Josue to the sun was not addressed to the sun at all." In a word, to his thinking, the theory of Galileo "contradicted the Scriptures, the teaching of the Fathers and of St. Thomas, besides making little of the philosophy of Aristotle." He added, however, that he wrote merely in the interests of religion, and that he had no intention of making a juridical deposition.

Cardinal Sfondrati at once sent these two documents to the Holy Office, which, according to its custom, began a secret inquiry, which lasted some months. Although both the report and the inquiry into its merits were supposed to be carried on in absolute secrecy, Galileo was informed of them by his many friends in Rome.

He at once hurried to Rome, eager to defend his views against his opponents, and hoping to win acceptance for them by reason of his many influential friends in that city. He was assured of the support of Monsignor Dini, Monsignor Ciampoli, and Cardinals Orsini, del Monte, Bellarmine, and Barberini. But,

on the other hand, the Dominicans who ruled the Holy Office were all opposed to him, and although a few Jesuits, like Father Greinberger and Father Torquatus de Cupis, shared his views, the Order as a whole had been commanded by its superior to be loyal to Aristotle. Cardinal Bellarmine, a great friend of the Pope, and a prominent member of the Holy Office, did not himself believe that the Copernican theory could ever be proved, although he admitted its possibility. He told Galileo he need not worry in the least, provided he was ready to accept any decision that the Church might see fit to give.

Galileo, if we are to believe his letters, was most submissive, for we find him writing to Monsignor Dini: "I would rather pluck out my eye than give scandal. I would do anything rather than resist my superiors and injure my soul, by maintaining against them an opinion which at present seems to me to be evident and worthy of credence."

At Rome, Galileo met with the same cordial reception which he had received on his former visit. He at once began to plead his cause with every one who would listen to him. In the salons of the chief families he attacked the views of his opponents with the greatest bitterness, so much so that his friends urged him to be less emphatic in his assertions, to confine himself to mere scientific arguments, and, above all, not, as a layman, to enter the provinces of the cleric by citing the Scriptures in his favor. This was excellent advice, but, it is needless to say, Galileo utterly dis-

regarded it. As the Grand Duke's ambassador, Guicciardini, wrote at the time, "It was his aggressiveness and imprudence that rendered inevitable the intervention of the Holy Office."

About this time two other works appeared which defended the Copernican theory and declared it in perfect accord with the Scriptures. One was *A Commentary on the Book of Job*, by Father de Zúñiga, and the other Father Foscarini's treatise on *The System of the World*. The latter, by publishing his work in the vernacular, caused so great a stir that a decision became all the more imperative.

Until the last moment, Galileo thought that the decision of the Congregation might be postponed indefinitely, or that it might even decide in his favor. We find him writing on February 20, 1616: "I will succeed in revealing the fraud of my adversaries. I will oppose them, and prevent any declaration being made that might cause scandal to the Church." But only the day before he wrote this letter, the theologians of the Holy Office had received a copy of the following propositions to censure: 1. The sun is the center of the world, and altogether immovable. 2. The earth is not the center of the world, nor immovable, but has a diurnal motion of rotation.

On February 23 the theologians met and agreed upon the following censures: The first proposition was declared "stupid and absurd in philosophy, and formally heretical, inasmuch as it expressly contradicted many passages of the Holy Scriptures, according to

the sense of the text, and the common interpretation and opinion of the Holy Fathers and learned theologians." The second proposition received the same censure in philosophy, and theologically was declared to be at least "erroneous in faith." On February 24 these censures were proposed to the Cardinals who were members of the Holy Office and approved by them. On February 25 these censures were read again in a final meeting, over which Pope Paul V presided.

The Pope then ordered Cardinal Bellarmine to summon Galileo and warn him to abandon his opinions. If he refused to promise "not to teach, defend or discuss his doctrine or opinion," he was to suffer imprisonment. On February 26, Galileo appeared before Cardinal Bellarmine in his palace, and promised to obey the orders that were given him.

On March 3, in a session of the Inquisition over which the Pope presided, Cardinal Bellarmine declared that the orders of the Pope and the Congregation had been carried out, and that Galileo had submitted.

Some writers used to question the fact of this order ever having been given to Galileo. They pretended that the registers of the Holy Office were falsified at the time of the second trial, in order to justify juridically the condemnation for which his enemies were clamoring. But the publishing of the original documents utterly refutes this false and arbitrary supposition.

On March 5 the Pope ordered the Master of the Sacred Palace to publish the decree of the Index, condemning absolutely the work of Foscarini, prohibiting the works of Copernicus and de Zúñiga until they were corrected, and, as a general law, banning all books that taught the immobility of the sun, and the movement of the earth.

It is worthy of note that out of respect to Galileo's great services to science, and his ready acceptance of the decree issued against his cherished views, the decree made no mention either of his name or his writings. The order given him not to defend in future the Copernican theory was a personal one, and all the members of the Congregation who knew of it were bound by their oath to keep it secret.

Some of Galileo's opponents, who did not relish this delicacy on the part of the Roman authorities, falsely spread the report that the Inquisition had imposed a penance upon him, and had forced him to abjure his heretical views. To answer these calumnies, Galileo wrote to Cardinal Bellarmine for a written statement of the facts. On May 26 the Cardinal wrote in reply: "Galileo has not abjured any of his opinions or doctrines before me or any one else, at Rome or elsewhere, nor has he submitted to any penance. He has simply been notified of the declaration made by His Holiness, and published by the Congregation of the Index, viz., that the doctrine of Copernicus, according to which the earth moves around the sun, and the sun remains in the center of the world, is contrary to the Sacred

Scriptures, and that, therefore, it cannot be defended or believed."

On March 11, Galileo was most kindly received in a long private audience by Paul V, who assured him that he was perfectly aware of the purity of his motives, and urged him not to worry in future over the attacks of his enemies. "While I live," he added, "you may be certain that your calumniators will not be believed."

We may mention here in brief the subsequent history of this decree of the Index. Kepler's *Epitome Astronomiae Copernicanae* was put on the Index in 1619; Campanella's *Apologia pro Galileo* in 1632, and Galileo's *Dialogo* in 1634. The work of Copernicus was taken off the Index in 1620, certain words being inserted which declared it a mere scientific hypothesis. The full text of the decree was published in all the editions of the Index until 1664, when it was replaced by the words, "All books teaching the movement of the earth and the immobility of the sun." It was not until 1822 that books teaching the Copernican theory could be printed in the city of Rome. Finally in 1825 all mention of any prohibition on this point was omitted from the Index.

Galileo, soon after the trial of 1616, left Rome for Florence, where he again took up his mathematical studies under the patronage of his friend, the Grand Duke of Tuscany. The letters of this period show clearly that the recent happenings at Rome had not in the least interfered with his reputation in either

the scientific or the ecclesiastical world. Monsignor Cesarini wrote him that "he was the unique glory of Italy and of science," while Cardinal Barberini, the future Urban VIII, dedicated to him in 1620 a long Latin ode.

A pupil of Galileo's, Mario Guiducci, in his *Discourse on the Comets of 1618* (Florence, 1619), attacked before the Academicians of Florence the work of Father Horace Grassi on the same subject (1619). The latter, convinced that Galileo was attacking him in the name of his pupil, replied in a work entitled *Libra Astronomica* (Perugia, 1619), under the *nom de plume* of Sarsi.

Galileo in turn answered this work four years later in his *Il Saggiatore* (Rome, 1623). This appeared under the form of a letter to his friend, Monsignor Cesarini, the Maestro di Camera of the new Pope, Urban VIII. In it he stated that the theory of Copernicus was in perfect accord with the observations of the telescope, and that the Ptolemaic theory was untenable. He then argued that as the first opinion had been condemned by the ecclesiastical authorities, and the second was contrary to reason, scholars were bound to look for a new theory which would be in accord with both reason and the Bible. Although the substance of the book was in reality only a skillfully veiled defense of the Copernican theory, Monsignor Riccardi did not perceive it, and at once gave it his *imprimatur*. In fact, he wrote of it in the most glowing terms. He said: "I have read *Il Saggiatore*, and

found nothing in it against good morals or the supernatural truths of faith. On the contrary, I discovered in it excellent teachings on natural philosophy which will make our age famous in ages to come. . . . I am happy to be the contemporary of so learned a man."

Pope Urban VIII was also deceived, and allowed Galileo to dedicate the book to him. More than this, he declared that he read it through with the greatest pleasure. Angered at the book's success, Father Grassi again attacked Galileo in his *Ratio Ponderum Libræ et Simbellæ*. Galileo ignored this attack, and allowed his pupil Guiducci to carry on the controversy alone.

The flattering reception given his new book by the Pope, encouraged Galileo in the belief that he would succeed in having the adverse decree of Paul V annulled. Many of his friends at Rome were of the same opinion, and, at their invitation, Galileo again visited Rome in 1624.

His reception was even more enthusiastic than before, for we find him writing on June 8 to Prince Cesi: "His Holiness has accorded me great honors, and I have had six long audiences with him. Yesterday he promised me a pension for my son, and three days ago he gave me a beautiful picture, a gold and a silver medal, and a number of *Agnus Dei*." In a letter to Ferdinand II, the Grand Duke of Tuscany, the Pope praised Galileo highly, both for his scientific genius and his ardent piety, and urged this prince to continue the patronage graciously accorded by his

predecessor. Galileo was unable, however, to persuade the Pope to accept the Copernican theory.

Elated by the special kindness of the Pope, Galileo forgot all about the promise he had made the Roman authorities in 1616. During his visit to Rome, he did his utmost to gain adherents to his cause, and wrote a letter to Monsignor Ingoli, in which he plainly defended the condemned theory. But, for some reason or other, this letter was altogether ignored by his opponents. Six years passed, during which he worked upon an open defense of the Copernican theory.

He made a fourth visit to Rome in 1630, in order to obtain the required *imprimatur* for his projected work from Monsignor Riccardi, the Master of the Sacred Palace. On examining the manuscript, Monsignor Riccardi saw at once that Galileo had utterly disregarded the promise he had made in 1616 to the Roman Congregation. He, therefore, required him to add a preface and a conclusion to his book, clearly stating in them that he set forth the Copernican theory merely as a scientific hypothesis, and that his arguments against the Ptolemaic theory were not to be regarded as decisive proofs of its falsity. The revision in detail was handed over to the Dominican Father, Raphael Visconti, who suggested a few further corrections. Galileo, much against his will, agreed to all these requirements. Monsignor Riccardi, therefore, granted the *imprimatur* for Rome, reserving to himself the right to correct the proofs of the book as they appeared. Pope Urban VIII, when informed about

the proposed volume, asked his private secretary, Monsignor Ciampoli, to make special inquiries about its publication. He was at once assured that Galileo was ready to fulfill all the conditions required by the Master of the Sacred Palace.

At this juncture Galileo left Rome for Florence. Hardly had he arrived there when he wrote Monsignor Riccardi for permission to publish it in that city. This permission was at first refused. Galileo wrote again, backing up his request by a personal letter from the Grand Duke. Monsignor Riccardi then wrote to the Inquisitor of Florence, leaving the matter entirely in his hands. He sent him, moreover, a list of all the corrections already agreed upon, and insisted on their being made before the *imprimatur* was granted.

In 1632 the book finally appeared under the title, *Dialogo di Galileo delli due Massimi Sistemi del Mondo*. It bore the authorization of the Inquisitor and the Vicar-General of Florence, and also the *imprimatur* of Monsignor Riccardi, although the conditions insisted upon had not been fulfilled. The preface and conclusion did appear, as promised, to satisfy the letter of the law, but they were evidently written in a spirit of ridicule and mockery. The book itself was undoubtedly a clear and formal defense of the Copernican theory. Two of Galileo's friends, Sagredo of Venice and Salviati of Florence, defended his views, and attacked his opponents most vehemently. An imaginary philosopher, Simplicio (imbecile), defended

the Ptolemaic theory in such a way as to bring out the force and strength of his adversaries' arguments.

This publication caused a great stir all over Italy, especially in Rome. Pope Urban VIII was very angry at the palpable dishonesty and trickery of Galileo, in having this book published without conforming to the conditions laid down by Monsignor Riccardi. Others say that he was indignant because he recognized some of his own arguments in the mouth of the stupid and ridiculous Simplicio. Galileo, hearing of this, wrote at once to the Pope's nephew, Cardinal Barberini, declaring that he had not the slightest intention of ridiculing the Pope in his book. Monsignor Riccardi at once ordered the printer in Florence to stop the sale of the *Dialogo*, and the Pope referred it, in August, 1632, to a special commission of theologians. This commission found him guilty, first of having disobeyed the Orders of the Holy Office, and of having broken his promise made to that tribunal in 1616, and, second, of having treated the Copernican theory, not as a hypothesis but as an absolute fact.

On September 23, 1632, the Pope ordered the Inquisitor at Florence to have Galileo appear in Rome for trial by October. Galileo, feeling certain that he would be condemned, did all he could to put off his journey to Rome. He first wrote for permission to appear before the Inquisitor of Florence, giving as his reasons his great age (he was nearly seventy), his ill health, and the fatigue incident upon the long journey to Rome. A second citation of November 19 allowed

Galileo another month's grace, but at the end of three months the Pope's patience was exhausted. Firmly convinced that all Galileo's excuses were mere subterfuges, he wrote the Inquisitor of Florence on December 30 to send Galileo to Rome, if need be in chains. There was no need to carry out this threat. Galileo, at last certain that he could no longer delay his journey to Rome, left Florence on January 29, 1633. He traveled in the litter of the Grand Duke, and arrived at Rome in perfect health on February 16.

According to law, he should have been imprisoned in one of the cells of the Inquisition, but an exception was made in his case, and the Villa Medici, the beautiful mansion of his friend Nicolini, was assigned to him as his residence. Later on, for convenience' sake during the interrogatories, he was assigned, not to the loathsome dungeon spoken of by ignorant controversialists, but to the apartments of the treasury of the Inquisition, where three good rooms were placed at his disposal. He remained there with his servant in perfect comfort, as he himself assures us, for twenty-two days, his meals being provided by his friend, Nicolini, the ambassador of the Grand Duke. Many of Galileo's friends assured him that he would not be condemned, but he himself was not so sanguine. Nicolini advised him not to discuss matters at all with his Inquisitors, but to grant at once all they asked, and to retract all that they demanded. "Otherwise," said he, "you will cause yourself no end of trouble."

The first interrogatory took place on the 12th of

April, and the last on the 21st of June. According to the general procedure of the Holy Office, the interrogatories dealt with two points, viz., the question of heretical fact and the question of heretical intention.

1. The question of Fact. Had Galileo taught in the *Dialogo* the opinion condemned by the decree of 1616, and which the Congregation of the Index had forbidden him to defend *in any form (quovis modo)*?

2. The question of Intention. Had Galileo, as a matter of fact, held as true this condemned theory?

To the first question Galileo replied in substance as follows: "I did not understand that the Congregation of the Index had forbidden me to teach the Copernican theory *in any form*. These words, *quovis modo*, indeed, are found in the official text of the decree of February 26, 1616, but I have no remembrance of them whatever. They are not to be found in the letter that Cardinal Bellarmine wrote me on May 26 of that year. He said simply that this theory was not to be held or defended (*non si possa difendere ne tenere*). I supposed that these words, written by one of the Inquisitors, expressed the mind of the Holy Office accurately, especially when they were viewed in the light of another letter which Cardinal Bellarmine wrote to Father Foscarini on April 12, 1616. In it are the words: 'Galileo will act prudently, if he contents himself with speaking *ex suppositione*, as Copernicus did.' "

He, therefore, thought he was perfectly justified in defending the Copernican theory in his *Dialogo* as a

mere hypothesis, but when the three consultors asserted that his book taught the theory positively and categorically as an objective truth, he admitted that through ignorance or inadvertence he had adduced two arguments which did favor too plainly the Copernican theory. He further promised that if ever again he were to write on the subject, he would put these two arguments in such a form that they would be deprived of all their effectiveness. He then signed his deposition, and again promised, if the requisite permission were given him, to refute all the arguments that seemed to favor the condemned theory.

Notwithstanding this labored denial of Galileo, the Inquisitors declared against him on the question of fact, agreeing with the consultors, who declared that the *Dialogo* taught the Copernican theory as an objective truth, and not as a mere hypothesis.

On June 16 the Pope, presiding at a solemn session of the Inquisition, ordered the Inquisitors to question Galileo about his intention. They were to threaten him with torture (*examen rigorosum*), and if he persisted in denying that he had really held the condemned opinion, they were to condemn him to the prison of the Holy Office. He was also to make a public abjuration, inasmuch as he was "vehemently suspected of heresy." They were also to order him henceforth never to discuss the condemned opinion in any form, or he would be considered a relapsed heretic. His *Dialogo* was to be prohibited, and copies of his

sentence were to be sent to all Nuncios and Inquisitors, especially the Inquisitor of Florence.

On being questioned about his intention on June 21, Galileo replied: "Prior to the decree of 1616, I was undecided, believing that both theories were equally probable, and might be scientifically defended. After the prohibition of 1616, relying on the wisdom of my superiors, I held that the Ptolemaic theory was alone indubitably true." He persisted in this statement, even though the judges pointed to his *Dialogo* as proving the contrary, and threatened him with torture (*territio verbalis*).

It is now universally admitted that although Galileo was threatened with torture, he escaped it because of his age and the influence of his many powerful friends in Rome. The only modern author that maintains he was tortured is Wohlwill, in his work, *Ist Galileo gefoltert worden*, published in 1887. Father Grisar has proved conclusively that the arguments of Wohlwill rest on an arbitrary and incorrect rendering of the words *esame rigoroso*. The acts of the trial, which of course Wohlwill did not possess in their entirety when he wrote, are utterly silent on the matter, which is the best possible proof that Galileo's judges did not proceed to this extremity. Besides, neither he nor his friends in any of their writings ever said one word about the use of torture.

The next day, June 22, at the Dominican Convent of Santa Maria sopra Minerva, Galileo's condemnation

was read in the presence of seven Cardinal Inquisitors. They declared him "vehemently suspected of heresy," inasmuch as he had held and believed a doctrine "false and contrary to the Sacred Scriptures." They made him read and sign an act of abjuration, in which he declared himself rightly suspected of heresy; they forbade the publication of the *Dialogo*, condemned him to the prison of the Holy Office, and imposed as penance the seven penitential psalms to be said once a week for three years.

It is at this meeting, after he had signed his abjuration, that Galileo was supposed to have stamped his feet in anger and to have cried out: "*E pur si muove—but it does move.*" This ridiculous statement was first made by the unreliable Abbé Iraillh in 1761, in the third volume of his *Querelles Littéraires*. No scholar to-day believes this fable. The records of the trial present Galileo as most submissive throughout. He would not have dared make such a statement, for it would have angered his judges, and have made them proceed at once to the harshest measures. As a matter of fact, on the very day of the sentence which condemned him to the special prison of the Holy Office, Pope Urban VIII commuted this penalty by assigning as his prison the villa and gardens of his staunch friend, Nicolini.

Galileo left on June 30 for Siena, where he enjoyed for five months the hospitality of another devoted friend, Cardinal Piccolomini. Towards the end of the year, on December 1, he received permission from the

Pope to retire to his own villa of Arcetri, near Florence. This was very near the Convent of St. Matthew, in which two of his daughters lived as religious. While he could receive visitors, he was not allowed to leave his house without the special permission of the Inquisition; and once even we know that this was refused, when he asked to go to Florence for a few days' medical treatment. The reason of this refusal was an anonymous letter sent to the Inquisition at the time accusing him and his friend, the Archbishop of Siena, "of un-Catholic opinions." When the storm caused by this accusation calmed down, he obtained leave to visit Florence for a fortnight, but all the efforts of his many friends, princes and prelates to have the penalty of imprisonment entirely remitted were of no avail.

He continued his studies undaunted until the end, and was visited by scholars from all over the world. He discussed scientific matters with many of his friends, and kept up a very large correspondence. He became blind in 1638, and this, together with the continual nagging of his opponents, rather embittered his last days, as we see in many of his letters. Still he edified those about him by his faithful performance of every religious duty. The Pope continued to grant him the pension of one hundred crowns which he had given him ever since 1630, and on his deathbed, January 8, 1642, he sent him the Apostolic Benediction.

His friends wished to erect a monument to him in the Santa Croce Church of Florence, but the Pope refused permission, saying to Nicolini: "It would not

be a good example for the Grand Duke to erect a monument to a man condemned by the Holy Office for a false and erroneous opinion which had seduced so many minds, and caused so great a scandal throughout Christendom.”

The honor long denied him was at last granted by the Holy Office on June 14, 1734, when he was buried in the Church of Santa Croce. The following inscription was placed over his tomb:

GALILÆUS GALILEI
GEOMETRIÆ ASTRONOMIÆ PHILOSOPHIÆ
MAXIMUS RESTITUTOR
NULLI ÆTATIS SUÆ COMPARANDUS

PART II

Now that we have a complete record of all the facts regarding the condemnation of Galileo, we are ready to answer the chief objections that non-Catholics are continually urging from them against the Catholic Church. There are, in substance, three in number, and may be worded, as they have actually been worded, on our missions to non-Catholics, as follows:

1. How can the Catholic Church claim to be infallible, when we know that in the seventeenth century she condemned the scholar Galileo as a heretic, simply because he held the Copernican system of astronomy? Did not the Popes of that day expressly declare that his views were against the teaching of the Bible, and will you not admit that they were wrong?
2. Does not the condemnation of Galileo prove that

the Catholic Church is in reality hostile to science? Did not the Popes, Paul V and Urban VIII, by their obscurantist opposition, do everything possible to hinder the progress of scientific studies in Europe?

3. Did not the Roman Inquisition, by compelling Galileo to abjure as false a theory which he held as certainly true, encourage hypocrisy, and prove itself thereby guilty of the worst form of intolerance?

As the vast majority of non-Catholics have the most erroneous notions with regard to the infallibility of the Pope, it may be good to cite here the Vatican decree on the subject. It runs as follows: "We teach and define it to be a doctrine divinely revealed that the Roman Pontiff, when he speaks *ex cathedra*, *i. e.*, when he is in the exercise of the office of pastor and doctor of all Christians, by virtue of his supreme apostolic authority, defines a doctrine regarding faith and morals to be held by the Universal Church, by the divine assistance promised him in Blessed Peter possesses that infallibility with which the Divine Redeemer willed His Church to be endowed in the definition of a doctrine regarding faith or morals; and that, therefore, such definitions of the Roman Pontiff are irreformable in themselves, and not in virtue of the consent of the Church." All theologians, therefore, teach that the Pope is infallible only when the four conditions of the Vatican Council are verified, *viz.*:

1. When he speaks *ex cathedra*, *i. e.*, as supreme Teacher and Doctor of the Universal Church. He is

not infallible as a private theologian, as preacher or author, as local Bishop, Archbishop, or Primate, or as supreme legislator, judge, or ruler.

2. When he *defines* a doctrine, *i. e.*, when he gives an absolutely final decision.

3. When he treats of faith or morals, including the entire revelation of God, and all the truths of philosophy and facts of history which are essential to the preservation, explanation, and defense of the content of revelation.

4. When he clearly manifests his intention of binding the Universal Church.

Since in the Galileo case not one of these four conditions was verified, we fail to see how any one can bring it forward as an argument against infallibility.

Before showing that the infallibility of the Popes is not at all involved in the present case, we will briefly mention what we consider as inaccurate answers made by some Catholic apologists.

Some have explained the error made by the ecclesiastical authorities by asserting that they dealt with a scientific question which was totally outside of their province. It was not a religious question at all, and, therefore, there can be no question of the infallibility either of the Church or the Popes.

On the contrary, the question was essentially a religious one, because it involved the meaning of certain passages of the Holy Scriptures. The Congregations were called upon to decide whether or not the

Copernican theory was contrary to these passages, and whether, therefore, it was to be rejected by every Christian as heretical. Both decrees expressly declared that they were issued with the avowed intention of "utterly destroying a pernicious doctrine, which was causing great injury to the Catholic faith." The decree of 1616 says: "*Ideo ne ulterius hujusmodi opinio in perniciem catholice veritatis serpat.*" The decree of 1633 in like manner reads: "*Ut prorsus toleretur tam perniciosa doctrina, neque ulterius serperet in grave detrimentum catholice veritatis.*"

Other Catholic apologists, like Henri de l'Epinois, have declared that the Church could not be held responsible in the present case, for both decisions were rendered, not in the name of the Popes, but only by two fallible Congregations of the Index and the Inquisition. But as we have seen above, both judgments were *de facto* rendered in the name of the two Popes, Paul V and Urban VIII.

On February 25, 1616, Paul V ordered Cardinal Bellarmine to command Galileo to abandon the Copernican theory, which the Consultors of the Congregation had censured as heretical. On March 3 he presided at the session of the Congregation, in which Cardinal Bellarmine declared that his orders had been carried out. On March 5 the Pope ordered the Master of the Sacred Palace to publish the decree of the Index which prohibited all books teaching the Copernican theory. On May 26, in the document that Cardinal Bellarmine gave to Galileo to answer the calumnies of

his enemies, we find mention again of the Pope's declaration, "that the Copernican theory was contrary to the Scriptures, and could not be defended or believed." Finally in the letter sent by the Prefect of the Congregation of the Index to all the Nuncios and Inquisitors, we read that the condemnation was made "by order of His Holiness."

The same holds good of the decree of 1633. On June 16, Pope Urban VIII presiding at a solemn session of the Inquisition, ordered the Inquisitors to question Galileo regarding his intention. The Pope also ordered him never again to discuss the condemned opinion, under penalty of being considered a relapsed heretic. The Pope also ordered the suppression of the *Dialogo*, and had copies of the sentence sent to all Nuncios and Inquisitors. It is, therefore, as clear as the noonday sun that the condemnation of Galileo and of the Copernican theory in 1616 and 1633 were really acts of Papal authority, and, therefore, acts of the Head of the teaching Church.

"It is true," writes Jaugey,¹ "that the Pope exercises his power at times directly and at times indirectly by means of the Roman Congregations, to whom he delegates a portion of his supreme authority. But in both cases, the decrees rendered have their origin and their effectiveness in the power of the Pope. The Roman Congregations form with the Pope but one and the same tribunal, as the Vicar-General with the Bishop; they are the instruments the Pope uses to

¹ *Le Procès de Galilée et la Théologie*, p. 35.

govern and to teach. If this is true when the Roman Congregations render their decisions in virtue of the general powers which they have received of the Sovereign Pontiff, it is still more true when the Pope intervenes personally in the decisions, as in the present case."

A few apologists, like the Jesuit Father Grisar, have endeavored to show that the opinions of Galileo were not condemned as heretical, but only as "temerarious," or, "contrary to the Scriptures." But his arguments fail to prove his contention. The words of Urban VIII, in a private conversation, and the personal opinions of a few theologians, prove nothing against the plain wording of the decrees of 1616 and 1633. This is the view of the great majority of Catholic scholars.

A careful study of the text of the two decrees proves to evidence that they were in no sense infallible pronouncements. There is no question in either of them of any *ex cathedra* teaching, or of any intention of proposing a doctrine to be held by the Universal Church.

The decree of 1616 merely prohibits all books that teach the Copernican theory. It does not command the faithful to hold the Ptolemaic theory as true, and the Copernican theory as false. It is, therefore, evidently a disciplinary decree, prescribing *what one must do, and not what one must believe*. It is true that the reasons that prompted the Popes and the Cardinals to pass the decree were doctrinal, but these

reasons never form an integral part of the decree itself. Even in an infallible decision they may be considered erroneous, as all theologians teach. That these reasons do not belong essentially to the decree itself is proved by the action of the Congregation of the Index, which in 1664 omitted all the words declaring the falsity of the Copernican theory, and made the decree read: "All books teaching the movement of the earth, and the immobility of the sun." We know also that before 1854 the Popes issued several disciplinary decrees on the Immaculate Conception, with the idea of strengthening that belief in the minds of the faithful; but no one ever dreamed of considering these decisions infallible.

The decree of the Inquisition in 1633 is even more clearly disciplinary in its scope. It is simply an official declaration of the guilt of Galileo, and an imposing of a sentence upon him for his disobedience of orders. The reasons again were doctrinal, inasmuch as they tried him for what they considered heretical opinions. But the reason of their condemnation does not of itself constitute an article of faith. It is not a definition *ex cathedra* issued by the Pope for the acceptance of the Universal Church.

The form in which both decrees were given also proves that they are not infallible pronouncements. The Abbé Vacandard writes:² "In a definition *ex cathedra*, it is the Pope who speaks in person; he may, if he choose, ask the views of the Congregations, but

² *Études de Critique et d'Histoire*, vol. i, p. 359.

their opinion is regarded only as a mere consultation; the sentence, properly speaking, is his work. In the trials of 1616 and 1633, the Popes order, but the Congregations act; it is they that pronounce the sentence. If, therefore, infallibility be an incommunicable prerogative, it is manifest that their decision cannot be infallible."

It is certain that neither in Galileo's time, nor in the period immediately following, can one theologian or scholar be cited who considered the two decrees rendered against Galileo infallible. On the contrary, many can be quoted who plainly assert that they were not infallible decisions.

In a letter to Father Foscarini, April 12, 1615, Cardinal Bellarmine wrote: "I wish to say that, if ever the Copernican theory be really demonstrated, we must then be more careful in explaining those passages of the Scriptures which appear contrary thereto. We must say then that we do not understand their meaning, rather than declare a thing false which has been proved to be true. But I do not think that such a demonstration will ever be made."

The Jesuit Father Tanner, writing in 1626, cites the decree of the Index, and asserts that the Copernican theory cannot safely be taught. He does not say that it is heretical.⁸

Fromont, a professor at Louvain, and an ardent opponent of Galileo, declares expressly that he cannot consider the Copernican theory definitely condemned,

⁸ *Theol. Scolast.*, ii, 6, 4.

"at least," he says, "until I see something more precise emanating from the Head of the Church."⁴

Descartes in his letters assures his friends of his loyalty to the decisions of the Roman Congregations, but he openly expresses the hope that one day they will be reversed.⁵

In 1643, Gassendi, a great friend of Galileo's, after declaring his willingness to give up the Copernican theory in view of its condemnation at Rome, adds: "I do not, however, consider their decision an article of faith. I do not believe that the Cardinals have so declared it, nor that their decrees have been promulgated or received by the whole Church. Their decision, however, should have great weight in the minds of the faithful."⁶

The Jesuit Father Riccioli wrote in 1651: "As in this matter there has been no definition by the Sovereign Pontiff, nor by a Council directed or approved by him; it is by no means of faith that the sun moves and that the earth is immovable, at least in virtue of the decree."⁷

Bishop Caramuel, writing in 1651, says: "What would happen if scholars were one day to demonstrate the truth of the Copernican theory?" He replies: "In that case the Cardinals would allow us to interpret the words of Josue x. as metaphorical expressions."⁸

⁴ *Anti-Aristarchus*, p. 17.

⁵ *Correspondance*, vol. i, pp. 270, 288. Edit. Adam-Tannery.

⁶ *De Motu Impresso*, vol. iii, p. 471.

⁷ *Almagestum Novum*, vol. i, p. 52.

⁸ *Theol. Moral. Fund.*, vol. i, p. 273.

The charge that the Catholic Church is essentially opposed to science has been frequently refuted in the writings of the Popes, and the decrees of the Councils, and is given the lie direct by the Church's history from the beginning.

Pope Leo XIII declared the Church's attitude in his encyclical, *Immortale Dei*: "As all that is true comes necessarily from God, the Church recognizes in every truth which scientists discover a sort of vestige of the divine intelligence. And as in the truths of the natural order, nothing weakens one's faith in the doctrines revealed by God, while many things strengthen it; and as every discovery of the truth can help us to know and love God, the Church will always welcome gladly any new discovery that will enlarge the boundaries of human knowledge. She will always encourage science which has for its object the knowledge of nature."

The Vatican Council teaches clearly that there can be no real opposition between the truths of the natural and those of the supernatural order, but it asserts just as clearly the Church's right to condemn those scientific theories which go counter to the truths of divine revelation. The words are: "Although faith is above reason, there can never be any real opposition between faith and reason, since it is the same God Who reveals mysteries and gives faith, and Who gives the human soul the light of reason. God, however, cannot contradict Himself, and the truth cannot contradict the truth. The vain appearance of such a con-

tradiction comes principally from the fact that the dogmas of the faith are not understood and set forth according to the mind of the Church, or that false opinions are taken for the certain teachings of reason.”

“The Church which, with the apostolic mission to teach, has received the command to guard the deposit of faith, holds also from God the right and the duty to proscribe false science, so that no one ‘be cheated by philosophy and vain deceit’ (Col. ii. 8). That is why all faithful Christians must reject as false those opinions which are opposed to the teaching of the faith, especially if they are denounced by the Church. They must also consider them not as the legitimate conclusions of science, but as errors hidden under the deceitful appearance of the truth. . . . The Church does not prohibit the profane sciences from using, in their own sphere, their own peculiar principles, and methods; but, while fully recognizing this true liberty, she watches carefully that they do not oppose the divine teaching by falling into error, or by going beyond their true limits.”

In the case of Galileo, we must remember that the scientists of the day were as bitter against him as the theologians. The majority of scientists then believed firmly in the truth of the Ptolemaic theory, and they felt convinced, and rightly so, that Galileo had not adduced one scientific proof for his new opinions. The judges who condemned him rejected his views as scientifically false, as well as dogmatically heretical.

Blame them if you will for believing too strongly in a current scientific theory, but do not be so ridiculous as to accuse them of any hostility to science itself.

As a matter of fact, did the condemnation of Galileo hinder the progress of scientific studies in Europe? That the Roman decisions retarded for a time the special researches that were one day to make the Copernican theory morally certain, we are perfectly willing to admit. Descartes, for instance, was one who gave up his researches on the movement of the earth, and kept from publication his *Monde*, which contained a defense of the Copernican theory. "He preferred," he said, "to be blamed for his silence rather than for his discourse." Of course, even after the decree of 1616, Galileo worked for years on the problem, and although after 1633 he desisted from further researches, his friends took up the problem where he had left it, although they had to pursue their studies in spite of the prohibition of the Holy Office.

Is it not strange that those who bring out this fact, never mention the opposition made by the Protestantism of the day to the Copernican theory? Luther thought Copernicus somewhat of a fool, while Melanchthon declared the new theory meant the destruction of all science. In 1659 we find Calovius of Wittenberg declaring that reason must give way to the teaching of the Scriptures, and that the Lutheran theologians of his day rejected the theory to a man. As late as 1744 we read of a Lutheran pastor of Ratze-

burg declaring that the Copernican theory was an invention of the devil.

That the Roman decrees hindered the general progress of science is absolutely false, for the Italy of that period fairly swarmed with scientists and scientific academies. Jaugey writes in the work cited above, p. 112: "At Florence, Prince Leopold de Medici, later on Cardinal, founded the Academy of the Cimento, to foster the natural sciences, especially the study of astronomy. This institution did not last long, but it included among its members Rinaldini, Oliva, and Borelli. At Bologna, a pontifical city, were two famous mathematicians, Ricci and Montalbani; the Jesuit Riccioli, the author of the *Almagestum*; the Jesuit Grimaldi who discovered the diffraction of light; Cassini who later on was to make the Paris Observatory famous; Castelli, Davisi, and a number of other scholars. In the same city, Mezzavacca published his *Ephémérides astronomiques*. At Rome Cassini discovered the satellites of Saturn; Megalotti studied the comets, and Plati made his remarkable discoveries on the eclipses of the sun," etc.

We come now to the last objection, which looks at the case from the moral point of view. Did not the Roman Inquisition, by compelling Galileo to abjure as false a theory which he held as certainly true, encourage hypocrisy, and prove itself thereby guilty of the worst form of intolerance?

If we are to judge by the official documents, Galileo

was not called upon by the ecclesiastical authorities to abjure what he believed to be certain. As we saw above, he declared in a letter to Monsignor Dini before his first trial in 1616: "I would rather pluck out my eye than give scandal. I would do anything rather than resist my superiors and injure my soul, by maintaining against them an opinion which at present seems to me to be evident and worthy of credence." After the decree had been published he wrote again on March 5: "The result of this affair has proved that my opinion is not accepted by the Church." In the letters he wrote a year or two before the second trial, he also showed himself most submissive. He writes on May 3, 1631: "If you could see with what submission and with what respect I am willing to consider as dreams, chimeras, equivocations, and falsities, all the proofs and all the arguments which in the judgment of my ecclesiastical superiors support a system, which they disapprove, you and the public would understand how strong is the sentiment that I now profess, never to have in this matter any other opinion or intention save that held by the Fathers and Doctors of Holy Church." Again on October 6, 1632, he writes: "I wish to show myself, as I am, a most obedient and zealous son of Holy Church." At the last interrogatory in the second trial of 1633, he asserted that "after the decision of 1616, relying on the wisdom of my superiors, I held as undoubtedly true the opinion of Ptolemy." Even though they threatened him with

torture, they were unable to make him admit that he had ever taught after 1616 the Copernican theory as an objective truth.

Yet despite all these positive assertions, we must admit that they contradict the general tone of his conversations, his letters, and his works, especially the *Dialogo*, in which he plainly defended, and at time with the greatest bitterness, the Copernican theory.

How are we to reconcile this evident contradiction? Do the official documents give us an absolute certainty with regard to Galileo's real sentiments, or are they, as many non-Catholics argue, merely the forced statements of a man unwilling to be a martyr for the truth? "This," says the Abbé Vacandard, "is a question very hard to answer. We think it very presumptuous for any one to assert that Galileo's solemn disavowal of his writings was insincere. We have good reason, however, to think that his mind was not always calm when he thought of his condemnation. It seems very probable that at times his mind reverted to the opinions which had been condemned. It is reported that his friend, Archbishop Piccolomini of Siena, assured him that 'he had been unjustly treated by the Sacred Congregation, and that one day his ideas would prevail.' Such a suggestion was calculated to produce feelings of bitterness against his opponents. We are not surprised, therefore, to find him giving expression to these feelings, at least in secret."⁹

⁹ *Etudes de Critique*, vol. i, p. 363.

In fact we have some notes of his found a few years ago in the library of the Seminary of Padua (ms. 352), which puts this beyond the shadow of a doubt. They are as follows: "*Apropos of Novelties*: And who doubts that this novelty of wishing that minds created free by God should become the slaves of another's will, is not of such a nature as to cause great scandal? To wish that others deny their own opinions, and submit to the will of another. To admit that persons absolutely ignorant of a science or an art are called upon to be the judges of savants, and have the power to treat them as they please in virtue of their authority. These are the novelties calculated to ruin republics and overthrow states."

He then addresses the theologians directly, saying: "The new doctrines that cause harm are yours, whereby you try to force the mind not to think and the eyes not to see. . . . It is you who are the occasion of heresy when, without any reason, you seek to interpret the Scriptures according to your private judgment, and desire scholars to deny their own views and convincing proofs. You are the authors of novelties which may cause the ruin of religion."

"These notes prove," says de Vréguille, "that despite his docility, he had not lost all faith in his genius and his discoveries. But there is nothing in them to prove that he regretted his abjuration. Intellectual submission to the Church's viewpoint was natural to him, although in his hours of questioning and suffering, his will was not always in control. Besides, he

was excusable, for the interior assent that was required of him by the Roman decrees was neither complete nor absolute, but was based only on motives of prudence.”¹⁰

As we have seen above, there was no Catholic theologian at the time who considered these decrees infallible or irreformable; absolute assent could not possibly be required to them, for there was a possibility that they might be erroneous. Jaugey thus writes on this matter of assent: “The intellectual assent required is proportioned to the motive on which it rests; as, in the present case, this motive is a declaration of the ecclesiastical authorities subject to revision, the assent of the mind thereunto cannot be absolute. The intellect, commanded by the will, submits because it has confidence even in the fallible decisions of the Holy See. This confidence, moreover, rests on the habitual wisdom of the Popes, the ordinary graces given them by God to govern the Church well, and the knowledge and virtue of the various members of the Congregations, whom the Pope consults and speaks through. That is what Galileo meant when he declared that he had given up the Copernican theory after 1616, relying on the wisdom of his superiors.”¹¹

All those who object to the forced abjuration of Galileo seem to think that he had demonstrated his theory. No scholar to-day holds that he did. He was much more skillful in answering the objections of his

¹⁰ *Dict. Apol.*, vol. ii, col. 181.

¹¹ *Le Procès de Galilée*, p. 119.

opponents than in setting forth positive proofs. The only three scientific arguments that he really did bring forward, based as they were on the phenomenon of the tides, the movement of the solar spots, and the apparent movement of the planets, either proved nothing at all in favor of the Copernican theory, or were in absolute contradiction to the facts. As the astronomer Laplace put it, he defended his views only by proofs from analogy. Such proofs have, undoubtedly, a real value, and even to-day they are the chief reasons for our belief in the rotation of the earth. But they are not capable of affording a demonstrative proof. Of course, he was ignorant of many facts that are known to the children of to-day, viz., the phenomena of aberration, the depression of the earth at the poles, the variation of the pendulum according to latitude, etc. We can hardly, therefore, blame his opponents when they refused to be convinced by arguments, which they thought—and rightly, too—proved their theory as much as his.

It has frequently been stated that the Jesuits were responsible for the condemnation of Galileo. Like many another accusation against them, this rests on no positive proof. Galileo himself thought they had something to do with it, for we have a letter in which, writing to Elia Diodati, he quotes a statement of the Jesuit Father Grienberger, Professor of Mathematics at the Roman College: “ ‘If Galileo had known how to win the affection of the Fathers of the Roman College, he could have lived in peace and happiness, and could

have written, as he thought fit, on any subject; even on the movement of the earth.' You see, therefore," adds Galileo, "that they are not combating me on account of my ideas, but merely because I am in disgrace with the Jesuits." We find this accusation repeated years after in the bitter pages of Pascal. What are the facts?

In the beginning we know that the Jesuits were his best friends. We find him writing, April 22, 1611, during his first visit to Rome: "Every one here is well disposed towards me, especially the Jesuit Fathers." Indeed, one of his first visits was to the Roman College, where Father Clavius, the Professor of Mathematics, received him most kindly, and assured him that he had verified his discoveries. Other excellent mathematicians among them were his friends, such as Guldin, Grienberger, and van Maelcote. Of course, there were some members of the Society who protested against the enthusiasm of their confrères, and objected to the novel views of Galileo. After 1611, when Galileo began to venture into the field of exegesis, even his personal friends among them held a bit aloof. There is a letter of Father Grienberger's to Monsignor Dini, written at this time, which says: "Let Galileo bring forward some convincing scientific proofs of his theory, before he begins to discuss the Holy Scriptures." Moreover, when Galileo began to attack Aristotle directly, they were obliged to take the field against him. For their fiftieth General Congregation, which assembled in 1593, had issued a de-

cree commanding all members of the Society to defend Aristotle; and superiors everywhere saw that this decree was enforced. The bitter attacks of Father Grassi, and a controversy also with Father Scheiner, who claimed to have first discovered the solar spots, further embittered Galileo. By 1633 he had completely broken with his old friends.

But to accuse them of bringing about his condemnation is an altogether different matter. They had no special influence with Urban VIII, nor with the members of the Holy Office. Only one of the Consultors of 1633 was a Jesuit, and there was not one of them among the Inquisitors.

The Dominicans were far more active in both trials, which was perfectly natural, considering their official position as members of the Congregation.

Independently of any religious order, it was the vast majority of the theologians of the day that urged the Holy See to condemn Galileo, because of his attacks on Aristotle, whose scientific theories were then accepted as certain, and because of his unwise venturing into the field of Scriptural interpretation. It is easy for us to-day to point out the mistakes they made in their overzeal for the defense of what they firmly believed to be the truth, but is it just or reasonable to judge the seventeenth century from the viewpoint of the twentieth? Their motive was certainly a high one—to defend, as they thought, a truth of divine revelation. They were right in maintaining the general law of exegesis, that Scriptural texts are to be

taken in their literal sense, unless there are good reasons to the contrary. They were wrong only in forgetting the wise teaching of both St. Thomas and St. Augustine, that in describing the phenomena of nature the Bible speaks according to appearances.

In a certain sense, this condemnation of Galileo was providential. It proves conclusively that whenever there is apparent contradiction between the truths of science and the truths of faith, either the scientist is declaring as proved what in reality is a mere hypothesis, or the theologian is putting forth his own personal views instead of the teaching of the Gospel.

THE END

THE UNIVERSITY LIBRARY
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, SANTA CRUZ

This book is due on the last **DATE** stamped below.

FEB 7 1968
JAN 20 1971
JAN 19 RECD

MAR 17 1971
MAR 18 RECD

OCT 25 1972
OCT 17 RECD

STORED AT NRLF

100m-8, '65 (F6282s8) 2373

BX890.C6 1916



3 2106 00020 6018

